DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 019 SP 020 245

TITLE	Teacher Preparation: Problems and Prospects. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session (September 9-10, 1981).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	105p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Assessment; *Educational Trends; Education Majors; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Schools of Education; Teacher Background; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Stereotypes; *Teacher Supply and Demand; Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

This report contains prepared statements and discussion, made before the House Committee on Education and Labor Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, on current problems and future developments in teacher education. Members of the Committee present at the hearing were representatives Simon (chairman), Weiss, Bailey, and Coleman. Witnesses before the committee were: (1) Sharon Porter Robinson of the National Education Association; (2) a panel, representing the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, composed of Dean Corrigan of Texas A & M University, Gwen Baker of Bank Street College, New York City, Mary Christian of Hampton Institute, Virginia, Judith Lanier of Michigan State University, and Nancy Quisenberry of Southern Illinois University; (3) Marva Collins, West Side Prep, Illinois; (4) Vincent Reed, Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education; (5) Milton Goldberg, Acting Director, National Institute of Education; (6) Thurmond Daniel, former teacher; and (7) a panel representing the American Federation of Teachers, composed of Myrna Cooper of the New York Teachers Center, New York City, Ronald Spruill of Baltimore Public Schools, and Paulette Bell of District of Columbia Public Schools. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217019

SP

TEACHER PREPARATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,
SEPTEMBER 9 AND 10, 1981

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 020 24

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
86-585 O WASHINGTON : 1982

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
KEN KRAMER, Colorado
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
EUGENE JOHNSTON, North Carolina
LAWRENCE J. DENARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

PAUL SIMON, Illinois, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky
(Ex Officio)

E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
(Ex Officio)
LAWRENCE J. DENARDIS, Connecticut
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri

CONTENTS

Page

Hearings held in Washington, D.C.:

- September 9, 1981 ... 1
- September 10, 1981 ... 61

Statement of—

- Baker, Gwen, Bank Street College, New York, N.Y ... 12
- Bell, Paulette, District of Columbia Public Schools ... 85
- Christian, Mary, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va ... 13
- Collins, Marva, West Side Prep, Chicago, Ill ... 51
- Cooper, Myrna, New York Teachers Center, New York, N.Y ... 82
- Corrigan, Dean, Texas A&M, College Station, Tex ... 10
- Daniel, Thurmond, former teacher, Arlington School District, Arlington, Va., current employee of private consulting and computer firm, and American Federation of Teachers Panel ... 80
- Goldberg, Milton, acting director, National Institute of Education ... 68
- Lanier, Judith, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich ... 14
- Quisenberry, Nancy, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill ... 17
- Reed, Vincent, Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education ... 61
- Robinson, Sharon Porter, National Education Association ... 2
- Spruill, Ronald, Baltimore Public Schools ... 84

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—

- Beli, Paulette, former teacher, District of Columbia Public Schools, director, Center for Ideal Education:
  - American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, prepared statement of ... 87
  - Prepared statement of ... 87
- Cooper, Myrna, New York Teachers Center, New York, N.Y., prepared statement of ... 82
- Corrigan, Dean C., Gwendolyn Baker, Judith Lanier, Nancy Quisenberry, and Mary Christian, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education:
  - "A Survey of Texas Public School Teachers," paper entitled ... 43
  - "Creating the Conditions for Professional Practice: Education's Unfinished Agenda," excerpt from the Journal of Teacher Education, March-April 1981 ... 36
  - Prepared statement of ... 21
- Goldberg, Milton, acting director, National Institute of Education, prepared statement of ... 74
- Reed, Vincent E., Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, prepared statement of ... 67
- Robinson, Dr. Sharon, director of instruction and professional development, National Education Association, prepared statement of ... 4

TEACHER PREPARATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1981

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Paul Simon (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Simon, Weiss, and Bailey.

Staff present: William A. Blakey, counsel; Lisa Phillips, majority staff; Jennifer Vance, minority senior legislative associate; and Betsy Brand, minority legislative associate.

Mr. Simon. The hearing will come to order.

Today we want to examine something that concerns those of us who believe education is one of the most important functions in this Nation.

Let me just read the SAT math and verbal scores for those entering college now. On the verbal, the scores vary from 507, which is the high—English majors—down to the bottom, 339, in general education. In mathematical skills, it is not surprising the high is for mathematics majors, down to the low in the field of education.

I do not have any answers. I do not know. The first question is; Is this significant? Is this at all any gage of the kind of teachers we are producing?

There is a second general concern, a question that I have: Does this indicate that schools of education ought to be setting up similar criteria for entrance as are law schools and engineering schools.

I spoke this past June at a commencement at the request of a friend of mine, in an area where I knew absolutely nothing. I spoke at the commencement of the Illinois College of Chiropody. In order to speak there I started reading up on chiropodists.

One thing I found out is that the State of Illinois pays a great deal more attention to who works on my feet than on my children.

Is the present system satisfactory?

Obviously there are areas where improvements can be made, pay being one of the most fundamental. It is a problem, it seems to me, that we ought to at least be probing, and that is what we hope to do in these hearings.

I think there are basic questions, and I do not know if there are answers to some of these questions, but let us at least take a look at them:

How can we attract the best students to the profession of teaching?

How do we improve the quality of teacher training to improve mastery of the subject matter and of teaching skills?

How can we improve the teaching environment for current teachers?

How can we keep the best teachers teaching?

Is there a Federal role in teacher training and continued professional development, and if so, what is that role?

How can we tell who will make a good teacher, if there is any way of telling?

Then I guess the most fundamental question of all is: Are these test scores significant, or are they not significant?

That is why we are here.

Mr. SIMON. I would like to call as our first witness Dr. Sharon Porter Robinson, with the National Education Association. Dr. Robinson has many distinctions, but has not lived down one reality in this life, and that is she was the classmate of the subcommittee staff director and counsel, William Blakey.

STATEMENT OF SHARON PORTER ROBINSON, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Ms. ROBINSON. It is a pleasure to be here.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Sharon Robinson, director of instruction and professional development for the National Education Association. As you are aware, the NEA represents over 1.7 million teachers employed in schools and postsecondary institutions in virtually all the cities and towns of America. We appreciate this opportunity to summarize the written testimony that has already been submitted to the committee and to respond to the committee's questions.

Mr. SIMON. Your full statement will be entered in the record.

Ms. ROBINSON. The written testimony and my summary of it today are based on assertions. Briefly stated they are:

One, public education is the cornerstone of a participatory democracy, and quality teaching is essential to the enterprise.

Two, our society can move forward only on knowledge, knowledge which gives us sound direction, meaning, and—hopefully—inspiration.

The three factors which affect the quality of education in our schools are, first, the talent attracted to the teaching profession; second, the quality of training teachers receive; and third, the environment in which teachers practice. I want to take a few minutes to elaborate on the first two of these points.

Let me talk about the person who would be a teacher. Historically, teaching attracted women and first-generation college graduates because: First, teacher preparation resulted in the awarding of an academic degree as well as certification guaranteeing professional status, and second, because it was one of the few professions easily accessible to women. Over the past 10 years, more professional options have been made available to women, so that the number of women entering the profession has been reduced by one-third. Further, the increased number of career options for all has intensified competition for intellectual talent.

Three, the concern now is what must the teaching profession do and be like in order to attract the best people. There needs to be a specified and rigorous knowledge and skills base which is given scholarly credibility. Local, State, and Federal governments need to offer incentives that will attract teachers into a critical profession. The average salary paid to teachers in the United States is $17,164, and that comes only after several years of practice and extensive and expensive graduate work. On the other hand, entry-level salaries for many professions exceed that which a teacher can ever expect to earn in a lifetime of work.

In order to attract talented people into the profession, teaching must be afforded recognition through an attractive compensation system and professional legitimacy. The current rewards for being a teacher are low pay and lack of adequate involvement in critical professional decisions.

Second, regarding teacher education, colleges of education must be held responsible for helping prospective teachers to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for teaching. But they, too, have been victims because not enough resources are allocated to do the job right.

The major responsibility for the content and quality of teacher preparation should lie with the total educational community, and that includes teachers. To this end, the NEA and its members are developing a "profile of excellence in teacher education." The NEA calls upon the colleges of education, researchers, and education professors to acknowledge teachers as professional peers.

Teachers also must have opportunities and incentives for continuous professional growth. Programs must be designed to reflect the fact that growth as a teacher is a lifelong process, a concept best illustrated in the Teacher Center program. Teacher Centers represent one of the few opportunities classroom teachers have ever had to define their classroom-based needs and to design a program to meet those needs.

NEA urges that the States more carefully monitor teacher education programs and that the standards for such programs be raised. We urge recognition of the competency of teachers to assume much of the responsibility for achieving higher standards for teacher preparation programs. Teachers, more than any other group, are appalled at the lack of professional preparation available to their prospective colleagues and will do much to assure that standards are raised and made more relevant to the practice of teaching. But we cannot do that job alone.

Let me summarize our position:

NEA urges the Congress to systematically study and play an appropriate role in solving the problems of teacher education. We urge this subcommittee to conduct regional hearings designed to determine the nature and structure of teacher preparation, the amount of financial and political support currently afforded it, and the amount required to improve it. We believe that informed public opinion is the best way to achieve recognition and redress of the severe financial and political problems attending the matter of teacher education. This study is suggested as an appropriate and effective means of Federal influence on the issue of teacher preparation.

Teachers are the focal point of quality education. They must have the respect of their peers and the community at large.

Teachers must be full participants in policy and instructional decisions affecting their professional careers.

Local, State, and Federal governments must rearrange priorities as expressed in governmental budgets and earmark the appropriate dollars to show that they recognize the importance of the teacher's role in the educational process.

I appreciate the opportunity to make these remarks. I look forward to your questions now—and later when you have had the opportunity to examine our full statement.

[The prepared statement of Sharon Robinson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. SHARON ROBINSON, DIRECTOR OF INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Sharon Robinson, Director of Instruction and Professional Development for the National Education Association. As you are aware, the NEA represents over 1.7 million teachers employed in schools and postsecondary institutions in virtually all the cities and towns of America. We appreciate this opportunity to testify today on an issue which is of vital and continuing concern to us.

The NEA has long had policy on the education of teachers. As recently as our 1981 national convention, more than 7,000 elected delegates refined our two primary statements to represent current thinking of the profession. Copies of both policies are provided for the Subcommittee's review.

IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING TO SOCIETY

Many observers of our public education system seem to insist upon applying an industrial model as a means of evaluating that system. They look at graduates of America's schools as they do cars coming off an assembly line. Though it is not likely that President Reagan's Administration would support Congressional recall of certain students, concern for quality education does seem to confound and frustrate us all.

Public education does a remarkable job of teaching the nation's children. Let's look at public education for what it really is. Children generally come to school after five years of experience in other spheres—a home and a community. They join millions of other children who bring with them different cultural traditions and values, different physical and intellectual capabilities, and different emotional strengths and weaknesses. The schools they enter vary in structural condition, materials and equipment, and financial support. Decisions about what should be taught and how it should be taught change from year to year and most frequently are made by politicians and others have had no training or recent experience in theory or practice of teaching and learning. A litany of problems—declining test scores, student discipline, teacher burnout—inevitably resound more forcefully than dramatic successes (which are substantially more numerous).

About 75 percent of all students enrolled in fifth grade in 1972 graduated from high school in 1980; 46 percent are currently enrolled in a degree program at a postsecondary institution, and about one-half of those will graduate in 1984.

Confidence in public education has not eroded as seriously as doomsday reports might lead one to believe. One-third of Americans, according to a 1979 poll conducted for the Education Commission of the States, would pay more taxes for support of education, 50 percent would hold school taxes and expenditures where they are, and only 13.3 percent would reduce them.

In 1950, only about one-half of white students and one-quarter of black students graduated from high school; comparable figures now are 85 percent and 75 percent respectively. That's hardly a "decline."

Public education is the most significant challenge of our society. When this challenge is answered in harmony with the basic principles of a participatory democracy, education will strengthen the Union and move us closer to realizing the great promise which is America.

More to the point of this hearing, I submit the following premises concerning the role of education in our Republic as a basis for considering the problems and challenges of preparing teachers.

Education, particularly public education K-12, is the foundation upon which a free society is built.

Public education is the cornerstone of a participatory democracy.

Society can move forward only on knowledge—knowledge which inspires.

The most critical profession in our society, therefore, is the teaching profession—the primary source of the transmission of knowledge, the vehicle through which our future is insured.

Teachers, as transmitters of knowledge, must have a large measure of respect and support to guarantee effective practice.

The history of education in the United States suggests confusion—over who controls it, what it should be about, and whether it is good or bad. An example of this confusion is teacher certification—the controlling point for entry into the profession, the culmination of preservice education. Many players are involved in this process: the colleges of education and their faculties, state certification agencies, state education agencies, local education agencies (which not only make educational policy but hire teachers), teachers and teacher trainees, and parents and the public at large. This nonsystem raises a very real question: who's in charge here?

There is one factor over which there is no confusion: the teacher has been treated as the most insignificant player on the educational team. Teachers have seldom been permitted to participate in major educational decisions, yet we ultimately have been fully accountable for the results. Willard McGuire, President of the NEA, best described the teachers' condition when he said:

"They attend a college or university in a state and receive the state-approved education leading to a state-accepted teaching credential. They are hired by a school system that establishes the standards they must meet. They teach a curriculum which they have not shared in developing. Then, when something goes wrong, the schools' critics say that teachers are at fault."

Teachers have in fact been victims of political fiat, changes in public attitude about what schools should accomplish, overcrowded classes, inadequate materials and lack of parental and community support. In recent years teachers have assumed a more assertive posture regarding such conditions. But when teachers seek to make inappropriate learning conditions known and propose solutions, politicians tend to dismiss those solutions by claiming that self-interest is our motive.

THE HISTORIC FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION

There has been and continues to be a healthy debate as to the proper federal role in education. NEA believes that primary responsibility for education rests properly at the state and local levels. But from the very beginning of our country there has also been an important national role. The nation's founders were concerned about education. Few, if any, disputed Thomas Jefferson's contention that a well educated citizenry is the basis for a free society. A well educated public asks the questions and demands the answers. That public sees and expects to participate in the prosperity of our land. It does not stand by and wait patiently for those who have wealth to share it.

The role of education in our society and economy has been almost axiomatic since the beginning of this century. The industrialization of our economy could not have taken place without the technology and human talent developed in educational institutions and the optimistic, forward looking work force produced by our public education systems. Likewise, the dramatic shift to the emphasis on the service sector of our economy was possible only because we are a well educated people.

Our national security and status as an international leader are directly dependent upon our competence and ability to deal with the peoples of our world. Our defense is based upon research and development carried out in institutions of higher education as well as in the private sector. Our military personnel must handle highly sophisticated weaponry. Our international relations are dependent upon our understanding of the multitude of world cultures and economics. Our productivity allows us to share our abundance with the less fortunate people of the world, and to help them seek a future universal prosperity.

I submit that this strong, consistent and comprehensive national interest in quality public education is legitimate and must be safeguarded by the federal government. That national interest is economic, technological, and social in nature: economic because an educated citizen is more likely to be gainfully employed, thus contributing to the tax base and not draining from it; technological because only an educated citizen is prepared to handle the increasingly sophisticated tools necessary to advance our industrial and military endeavors; and social because equality of opportunity in a nation which is diverse cannot be achieved solely by relying on the tax base of the local community. As NEA Executive Director Terry Herndon has said:

"We have struggled to assure that every mind—no matter the sex of the body, no matter the color of the skin, no matter the faith of the heart, no matter the language of the tongue, no matter the financial status of the family, no matter, no matter, no matter—every mind shall have a maximum opportunity to develop in a high quality, free, public school and an appropriate institution of higher education."

This is NEA's commitment, and this is rightfully the nation's commitment.

THE REFORM OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, reform in public education is sorely needed. Teachers are capable of carrying the responsibility for that reform and are willing to do so—but not alone. A partnership in reform is required—a partnership of government at all levels, the public, parents, and the education community. The NEA calls for such a partnership, united by the goal of quality education. We call for commitment to and respect for the teachers who educate the citizens of the future. We call for recognition of the need to provide adequate financial support for every phase of the education enterprise. And we call for improvement in the professional training of teachers. Together we must affirm the essential roles that education and teachers play in our society so that the problems of schooling in America may be treated as a whole, not subject to piecemeal prescriptions that address the symptoms but not the disease. Teacher preparation is an important, but not the only, element to be faced.

We would like now to turn your attention to the specific issue of teacher preparation, using the premises stated earlier as the basis of our approach.

Three factors affecting the quality of education

Three factors affect the quality of education in our public schools today: (1) the talent attracted to the teaching profession, (2) the quality of training teachers receive, and (3) the environment in which teachers practice.

The talent attracted to the teaching profession

In order to attract talented people into the profession, teaching must have two essential elements: an attractive compensation system and professional legitimacy. Unfortunately, the current rewards for being a teacher are low pay and lack of adequate involvement in critical professional decisions.

In 1980–81, the national average salary actually paid to classroom teachers was a paltry $17,264—representing all levels and reflecting disparate experience and academic credentials attained, and reflecting also tremendous differences in pay scales from just under $13,000 average in New Hampshire to $29,078 [1] average in Alaska. That figure compares unfavorably with even entry level salaries for engineering ($20,136), mathematics and statistics ($17,604), computer sciences ($17,712), and the liberal arts ($13,296). Comparable mean entry salaries for teachers holding a bachelor's degree were $11,758). For this kind of money, teachers are expected to mold the citizens of tomorrow; produce scientists, computer experts, and political leaders; provide the ethical and moral backbone of our society's young; and do it while attempting to raise their own families.

Historically, teaching attracted primarily women to the profession as a result of two factors: (1) it was one of the only professions which allowed them a BS degree as well as certification guaranteeing them professional status and (2) it was one of the few professions easily accessible to them. Over the past ten years, more professional options have been made available to women so that the number entering the profession has been reduced by one-third. The concern now is what must the teaching profession do and be like in order to attract the best people. There needs to be public recognition of the importance of teaching, of the essentiality of what a teacher does; there needs to be a specified and rigorous knowledge and skills base which is given scholarly credibility. Local, state, and federal governments need to offer incentives that will attract teachers into a critical profession.

Until we all recognize that teachers are the central figures in the world of schooling and must receive the compensation and respect equal to that role, we cannot hope to attract the best from the professional talent pool.

The quality of training teachers receive

In regard to the quality of training a teacher receives, colleges of education must be held responsible for helping prospective teachers acquire the knowledge and skills essential for teaching. NEA believes the quality of training is not as demanding as it should and must be. But colleges of education have also been victims. They have had to be dependent on their own institutions for the money to carry out their programs and on the state and federal governments to earmark them specifically in education budgets—an indication of the importance that teacher training, and hence quality education, holds in any Administration. As a result, there is far too great a variety in the caliber of teacher education programs.

---

[1] NEA Research Memos: Prices, Budgets, Salaries, and Income. Spring, June 1981. Estimates of School Statistics, 1980–81.

The major responsibility for the quality of teacher preparation should lie with the total education community, and that includes teachers. To this end, the NEA and its members are currently developing a "Profile of Excellence in Teacher Education." The document will describe what NEA sees as requisite for proficiency in professional learnings, teaching content and methodology, and field experiences. Such standards will provide a sound basis for attracting people who want to be part of a mature and integretous profession. It will also be the basis upon which NEA can organize coalitions of various educational associations to ensure improved quality instruction in our schools.

The creation and maintenance of this professional knowledge base will require specific types of pedagogical research—research in which teachers are partners in identifying a problem, participating in the investigation, and applying the findings. Such contributions will ensure that teachers are achiveing the best preparation available.

NEA calls upon colleges of education, educational researchers, and education professors to acknowledge classroom teachers as professional peers. It is time teachers participated in the decisions being made for and about them. After all, who knows better than teachers what the problems of instruction are? Who knows better than teachers what skills and knowledge are needed to function effectively in a classroom? Who knows better than teachers what research is needed to enhance the learning process?

Teachers must also have opportunities and incentives for continuous professional growth. The NEA perceives continuing education for teachers to be:

An essential part of a career in teaching, and a natural extension of preservice preparation;

Based on teacher needs as identified by teachers;

Planned, governed, and evaluated by teachers and others directly related to the school enterprise; and

Integrated into the professional assignment through negotiated contracts, where applicable.

Continuing education must be designed to reflect the fact that, just as with other professions, growth as a teacher is a lifelong process. It should include both job-related staff development to meet school purposes as well as personal professional development to meet a practitioner's specific needs. Such a program must be planned by local schools and their teachers and financed initially through innovative federal legislation and ultimately through state and local financing.

This concept is best illustrated in the Teacher Center program developed pursuant to the Higher Education Amendments of 1976. The concept has now been established and, although recent Congressional action has gutted the funds available for it, some state and local governments are picking up on the idea. For too long, decisions regarding the type of training teachers need have been made by non-teachers and imposed without benefit of input from the practitioners. The formulation of the Teacher Center program reversed this traditional oversight. Teacher Centers represent one of the very few opportunities the classroom teacher has ever had to define perceived professional needs and to participate in designing a program to meet those needs. And, teachers are strongly supportive of this program.

NEA also calls upon every state government to create a board of teachers and other education professionals to work together in monitoring and assessing programs of teacher education so as to ensure that all teachers enter the classroom with the proficiency required for effective instruction.

Finally, NEA calls on the Congress to turn its attention to this important matter, and for this Subcommittee to conduct regional hearings to determine the appropriate nature and structure of good teacher preparation, the amount of financial and political support currently afforded such programs, and the amount required to improve them. We believe that infomed public opinion and subsequent action is the best way to achieve recognition and redress of the severe financial and political problems attending the matter of teacher education. The proposed study is suggested as an appropriate and effective means of federal influence on the issue of teacher preparation.

The environment in which teachers practice

Thus far I have discussed the talent attracted to teaching, and the nature of the training a teacher must receive. Finally, teachers must be able to practice in an environment which is conducive to effective application of their knowledge and skills.

Aside from issues pertaining to instruction, improper facilities for learning, inadequate materials and equipment, overcrowded conditions, and lack of discipline are only a few of the problems teachers encounter daily. These problems cause teachers to experience grave frustrations and are indigenous to the school system, the community, parents, and local government. Yet, teachers are eager to work to alleviate these problems, so they may teach school—the job for which they have prepared.

Mr. Chairman, ensuring that we always provide our children with the knowledge and skills they need to function well calls for a serious commitment by the entire education community, the public and all levels of government. That commitment must be to plan, design, implement, and finance quality pre-service and continuing education for all teachers.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of teachers and the need for improving teacher education; and I would like to reemphasize my earlier recommendation to the Subcommittee for hearings. Further, I suggest that you move those hearings away from Washington and into the field. NEA and other representatives of national education organizations can give this Committee insights, but the chance to hear ideas and concerns about teacher education firsthand from practitioners would be the most valuable input you could obtain. You can also hear from other entities which influence the education process. And, I strongly recommend that you make at least one on-site visit to an operating Teacher Center, where you can observe the enthusiasm of teachers who are participating in the decision making process. Please allow me to offer NEA's full cooperation and assistance in scheduling hearings and soliciting witnesses for them.

In summary, then:

Teachers are the focal point of quality education.

This Committee, by holding the field hearings we propose, can serve to highlight and focus attention on the strengths and weakness of teacher preparation and certification, gathering evidence to help point the way to much needed improvements.

Teachers should and must be full participants in policy and instructional decisions affecting their professional careers.

Local, state, and federal governments must rearrange priorities for education expenditures and earmark the appropriate dollars to show that they recognize the importance of the teacher's role in the educational process.

Finally, we again commend the Subcommittee for initiating this process and examining the whole area of teacher education. We hope this oversight review will ultimately foster the needed cooperation among the professional education community and the public at large to work together to achieve the kind of teacher preparation that will best serve the nation's students. We look forward to assisting you in this important step forward.

Mr. **Simon**. Thank you very much. I could not agree with you more on the important role that teachers play. We are really talking about the future of our country. I recall a study that was done at Harvard a few years ago on foreign language teachers, and it is my assumption this would be true in every field. They found when they had audiovisual aids, all the expensive equipment, the net result was if you had a good teacher, and you did not have the good equipment, you still had a good product; if you did not have a good teacher and you had all the most expensive equipment in the world, you ended up without a good educational product. So, the teacher is the key.

I talked recently with a student friend of our family. She is going to be a junior in college. She started out to be a teacher, took a couple of teacher education courses, and she found them so dull that she shifted out and is moving into another area.

You say NEA—and we are going to have a panel getting into this shortly—NEA believes the quality of training is not as demanding as it should and must be.

What I ran into in one student, do you think it is a much too common type of situation?

Ms. ROBINSON. I think one of the most often heard complaints of veteran teachers and teachers entering the profession is a recognition of the lack of relevant training on day one, the kind of training that offers security and a sense of proficiency that allows you to enter the classroom equipped to practice on a safe level.

As we have advocated stronger standards and greater involvement of teachers, we have had to define what it was we would have if we were to achieve greater power and authority in the arena of teacher preparation. That led to the project I mentioned in the testimony.

We are trying to achieve consensus around the academic content of the teacher training program.

What we are finding is that a great deal of thought and consideration has been given to this matter and that schools of education invariably have attempted to upgrade standards and invariably have run into problems of finance, problems of attracting rigorous scholars to that part of the education enterprise, and so it becomes a virtual quagmire of financial constraints, constraints that relate to the status of the entire enterprise of educating this Nation.

Mr. SIMON. You did not call it sabbatical, but you referred to something similar. What percentage of elementary and secondary schools have any kind of a sabbatical program at all?

Ms. ROBINSON. The ability for a negotiator to indicate policy is a very young advent within the profession of teaching. At this point I would have to say that would have to be a very low percentage. The job of teaching has been defined very, very narrowly because the function of being in that classroom relates to custodial care. Teachers out of the classroom are often viewed as an unwelcome administrative problem. So for a teacher to pursue a full life which would allow them to take sabatticals, attend professional meetings, be involved in curriculum planning activities, all these things must be done either on the teacher's time, after school, during the summer or whatever, or the release time is achieved through some very rigorous negotiations or working with school administrators just to get that to occur.

These opportunities seem to be regarded as fringe benefits for the teacher rather than as activities that have to do with a rich professional career.

Mr. SIMON. Do you think that these test scores—and there are a variety of figures, I just read one sheet here—whether it is taken by an individual university or not, they all seem to point in the same direction. Is that something we should be concerned about? I am just curious.

Ms. ROBINSON. I think we should be concerned only to the extent we understand how valuable the test scores themselves are. I think we need to recognize these scores represent a shift in policy during the past 25 years from one of exclusion from the educational process to one of inclusion. So indeed, we are measuring many more people and different types of people from those who were included in the standard measures in years past.

So to the extent we can trust those numbers to really represent, I think we might pay attention to that.

Indeed, we are not attracting the most academically talented people because there are too many lucrative options for young people to pursue. This is a shame because a career as a teacher can be a rewarding career given certain orientations to that career, and a rich one.

Mr. SIMON. I thank you very much. My colleague, Mr. Weiss, from New York cannot be here because another subcommittee is having a hearing on the air traffic controllers' strike.

Some of my colleagues may have questions that I want to submit to you for the record, and we may be back in touch with you in the future as we probe. I frankly do not know what we specifically are going to do. I have no agenda. I have no formula in my hip pocket as to what we ought to be doing other than I sense we ought to be taking a look at this, and we appreciate your testimony very much.

Ms. ROBINSON. I thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. We will go on to our panel: Dean Corrigan, Texas A&M, College Station, Tex.; Gwen Baker, Bank Street College, New York, N.Y.; Mary Christian, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.; Judith Lanier, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.; and Nancy Quisenberry, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.

Dean Corrigan.

STATEMENT OF DEAN CORRIGAN, TEXAS A&M, COLLEGE STATION, TEX.

Mr. CORRIGAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee; the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Education and Labor Committee. We appreciate Chairman Simon's willingness to hold these public hearings, particularly during this time of uncertainty about the future of Federal support for education personnel development. I hope we can generate some enthusiasm in other people. There is a time bomb that could in fact change the fabric of American education unless we do something about it right now.

The panel we have here is representative of a number of institutions that have programs for the preparation of teachers:

Gwen Baker is vice president at Bank Street College of Education in New York City, an institution noted for its quality teacher education programs and commitment to urban education;

Mary Christian directs a school of education in one of the Nation's prestigious predominantly black private institutions—Hampton Institute;

Judith Lanier, a dean at Michigan State University, represents a major teacher education program—the third largest producer of new teachers in the Nation—that has made a major commitment to educational research and development through its Institute on Teaching; and

Nancy Quisenberry is associate dean of the College of Education at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, which is an institution that has a long tradition in teacher education.

Our comments today will focus on the theme identified by you, Mr. Chairman, as the problems and prospects facing teacher education. Rather than reading our testimony, I would ask that it be included as a part of the record, and the panel and I will then summarize the points we wish to make with the subcommittee.

Mr. SIMON. That sounds fine. Your statements will be entered into the record.

Mr. CORRIGAN. Today the preparation of teachers, counselors, principals, and school administrators takes place in some 1,400 institutions of higher education [IHE's] from Harvard to Los Angeles State University and from Pacific Lutheran College to Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University. More than 70 percent of all higher education institutes provide teacher education programs, although the largest share of new personnel, 45 percent, are trained in public master's-level State colleges and universities that have as a part of their legacy a tradition of pedagogical emphasis. In terms of pedagogical, perhaps the most serious problem is the one already identified by Sharon Robinson in her testimony. It has to do with what we feel is a crisis in terms of a coming teacher shortage. The public has not seen it yet. Those of us in training teachers have seen a situation, for instance, where there has been a 50-percent decrease in the number of students entering teacher education programs from 1972 to 1980. At the same time, we see a changing image of the role of the teacher on the part of freshmen coming into teacher education institutions which may be just as significant. In 1969, it was reported that over 40 percent of the freshmen polled indicated teaching as a field of preference, as a career. In 1980, less than 6 percent of the freshmen students indicated they would select teaching as a career today.

The other factor that is just as significant I feel is the tremendous increase in the numbers of teachers leaving the profession, experienced career teachers, who I think are engaged in what I would call a silent strike. They are just quietly leaving the profession. To me, it is not surprising. When we look at the situation, as Joe Cronin has said, if you look at the facts, why not expect the situation to be what it is. In Texas we did a study, where after 11 years of teaching, the average teacher's salary is $14,000 a year. Over 80 percent of the teachers moonlight. The only jobs they can get because of the economy in the summertime are jobs as clerks, garbage collectors, or jobs which do not capitalize on their training. This is demoralizing to a teacher. Until we do something to enhance the practice, as well as improve the training, we will not solve the problems.

Now I would ask my colleagues to address the theme of problems and prospects from the perspective of their institutional situation. I will first call on Gwen Baker.

STATEMENT OF GWEN BAKER, BANK STREET COLLEGE, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Ms. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address one issue, and that is societal expectations. I would like to begin by referring to a paragraph from our formal testimony.

During the past 30 years, schools have increasingly been used as instruments for social change through a combination of shifts in general societal expectations, legislative mandates, and court decisions. As a result, schools still are held responsible for developing the basic skills and knowledge that has been their traditional domain, but they have also been given responsibility for implementing solutions to problems ranging from nutrition and health to desegregation. While it appears that there may be less consensus about the propriety of such roles than there has been in the past, the multiple expectations of the schools has added to the challenge of training teachers.

The teacher who was trained 10 to 20 years ago was trained to help educate and to teach a population of children that was different from the clientele schools and teachers are serving today. Schools and classrooms today are as diverse in lifestyles, language, and behaviors as the national census tells us our overall population is. This diversity impacts not only on what children must learn in order to be successful contributing citizens but also how they can learn best what it is they need to know. The teacher who is being trained today needs a very different kind of training than the teacher of 10 years ago in order to be an effective teacher. Schools and colleges of education must revamp preservice and inservice training programs so that the training received will help educators learn how to respond in appropriate ways to the diversity that is ever present in the schools of this Nation. For example, all teachers should be trained to be bilingual. Teachers who are bilingual can better understand and teach the child who comes to the learning environment with a language that is different from English as well as the child who is handicapped by only being able to speak English. Teachers need to be prepared to reach in positive ways to the culturally different backgrounds of their students. Effective teaching requires teachers who are able to work with students and parents who live in ethnically, socially, and economically diverse communities. Teachers must have the skills that will aid them in working with students who come from monocultural backgrounds and communities to learn how to function effectively in a culturally diverse world.

Teacher training programs should be designed to attract the bright and gifted student including those who are already bilingual, those who are minority and familiar with cultural diversity.

Retraining teachers who are presently in service and restructuring current preservice teacher training programs to meet the educational needs of a Nation that is as diverse as ours will require Federal incentives and support, incentives and support that will encourage the continuation of internship-type programs as are demonstrated by the teacher corps approach, needed research such as studies conducted and disseminated by the National Institute of Education, the development and demonstration of educational innovations, and other kinds of teacher development programs produced by educational laboratories and centers. As was stated in the New York Times earlier this week, ethnic and cultural diversity has been and will continue to increase in every region of the country. Teacher training in the past has prepared teachers to teach from a melting-pot perspective—one that assumes and demands that all students be alike. Our history, the history of a country, developed by many, is with us today in the classrooms of our Nation insisting that our differences be acknowledged. Teacher training institutions must retrain and prepare teachers for teaching in a multicultural society.

Mr. CORRIGAN. Mary.

STATEMENT OF MARY CHRISTIAN, HAMPTON INSTITUTE, HAMPTON, VA.

Ms. CHRISTIAN. I am pleased to be here this morning. My colleagues have given the foundation; I will not be redundant.

Also, Mr. Simon, I was very encouraged that you made a statement which was a part of the context of my remarks. In looking at teaching, not only in its academic setting but looking at teaching more broadly from a more all-inclusive standpoint when we speak of training, we do relegate it to an academic area, and we are now almost struggling for survival in teacher education.

But if we look at it in its broader perspective, we will then recognize that education is the most important single force in the lives of the people of our Nation today. Education is the most accessible and in most cases the only avenue for many to the realization of the promise and dream of American democracy—for satisfactory employment, adequate health services, desirable housing, and the extras that make America the best country in the world in which to live, can be gotten only through effective education. And the bottom line to all this, Honorable Chairman and members of the committee, the bottom line is written by those who direct the educative process—the teachers. The extent to which these teachers are prepared to help Americans realize the democratic dream depends largely on the Nation's program in teacher education. And that is one of the areas that I think that we have not, as a nation, truly addressed.

In terms of some very specific kinds of things, our students who are attracted to teacher education can be attracted more fully if they are in a profession which has both the respect, the prestige, and the salaries that go along with it.

When we talk to teachers, we talk about dedication rather than dollars. The dedication, as the teacher says, will not pay the rent. Many young people come to our colleges imbued with lofty ideals, but the word of how the real world is spread around the campus, and ideals are exchanged for practical considerations.

From the perspective of the private black college, this is particularly a frightening phenomenon. I do not speak emotionally, but as one who would fight to preserve these endangered species of our life.

I have been at Hampton Institute for 20 years and have witnessed teacher education dropping from the largest school on campus to now one of the smallest on campus. I have witnessed that the bright young minds are not coming into teacher education.

We know in prior decades, blacks entered and graduated from predominantly black private and State colleges; they learned to teach or work at a manual trade because that was just about all that was available. Teaching was revered, because it offered the best avenue for upward mobility and the opportunity for a professional career. Today there is a wide spectrum of vocational and professional careers available, and no longer is the teaching profession so attractive. In addition, many of the predominantly white colleges and universities, through their abundant resources and lucrative scholarships, continue to attract the most accomplished, most able black students and faculty, leaving black colleges with most of the students who need academic and financial support. Those who come and finance their education with multiple loans look for occupations or careers through which they can repay these loans and still make a living.

Our Nation yet requires, for its very survival, the diligent use of and support of every resource at its disposal. Black colleges, black youth are part of those resources. Never before has so important a constituency asked for so little to do so much for its country.

We implore our wise leaders to recognize not only our past accomplishment, but the real and essential promise of our future.

Education generally, and teacher education specifically, need every support a good and bountiful nation can muster.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Mr. CORRIGAN. Judith.

STATEMENT OF JUDITH LANIER, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH.

Ms. LANIER. I would like to respond to two of the major questions I heard you address regarding the significance of the test score decline. The question, is it significant, in my professional view is yes; it definitely is. Second, in response to your question, is the present system satisfactory, I would answer with as emphatic a no as my earlier yes. My views of these questions you have asked, are the following remarks and suggestions.

Professional organizations and the press have been trying to alert the public to the pending crisis in the quality of teaching and teacher education. But what seems to be needed is some high drama, something on the order of Russia's Sputnik launching—with strong spokespersons like Conant and Rickover to direct a needed response. Such powerful events and personalities are not now present, however, and we seem to be floundering in a general malaise. I applaud this subcommittee for their foresight and concern in examining the problems in teacher education and exploring some possible remedies to the troublesome situation we face.

As you know, the problems of teacher education are numerous and complex, and our time here is limited. I have decided, therefore, to speak briefly to three problems that might be addressed through Federal intervention. One problem concerns the decline in academic quality of students preparing to teach; another concerns the rigor of academic programs for teachers; and the third concerns the professional knowledge base needed by teachers.

The problem of a reduced talent pool for persons entering teaching is well recognized. In a recent New York Times article, entitled

"A Warning on the Decline of Quality in Teacher Training," Fred Hechinger drew the public's attention to the fact that the academic aptitude of high school seniors choosing teaching is at the bottom of those entering college classes. He discussed some of the probable causes, including the low pay and job security in teaching, the opened access and recruitment of women and minorities into alternative careers, the boredom of teaching, the public's generally negative attitude toward teaching, and the low intellectual stimulation provided by many schools of education.

But rather than analyze or criticize these suggested causal factors, or suggest unrealistic remedies (for example, doubling teachers' salaries or changing the public's attitude through P.R. campaigns), I would suggest that we simply acknowledge that many social and historical factors beyond our control have created these problems. We must now search for some possible remedies.

The ability of our institutions to attract top-flight talent into teacher training programs could be addressed frontally in the decade of the eighties if it were deemed a priority. The argument can easily be made that talented youngsters deserve talented, energetic, and imaginative teachers. By all criteria of fairness and equity, however, that same argument can be made for our public school students generally.

When the Nation faced a critical shortage of medical doctors, and the public was threatened with inadequate and insufficient health care, steps were taken to remedy the situation. Federal capitation grants were given to qualifying institutions for increasing enrollments. Similarly the Public Health Service was given a major scholarship program to induce talented persons into medical programs. The scholarship recipients were supported for their years of professional schooling and subsequently required to return society's investment by serving the public for as many years as they were supported—for example, working on Indian reservations, in prisons, or for the National Health Service Corps.

While the problem in teaching is not a shortage of quantity alone, it is one of quantity as it relates to the number of talented individuals entering teaching. A Federal program of grants to talented prospective teachers, analogous to the successful capitation grants and scholarship programs for medical schools, could do much to encourage the recruitment of talented prospective teachers and to raise the quality of existing programs. Let me say at the outset that criteria for the identification of such talented students and institutions that might qualify would have to be approached deliberately and fairly. Such an effort should be buttressed not only with rigorous standards, but also with rigorous and explicit provisions for the recruitment of talented ethnic minorities.

An equally important facet of such federally supported programs for talented prospective teachers would be the willingness, indeed the obligation of participating educational institutions to provide rigorous, realistic, and rational teacher preparation programs characterized by defensible and sturdy academic standards. Not wishing to send talented prospective teachers to programs of low intellectual stimulation would force judgments regarding program and institutional quality. This brings us to the second problem to be addressed, the rigor of professional programs for teachers.

Academically respectable programs for teachers require talented students; they also require institutional commitment and strong cooperative relationships between the college or department of education and the academic disciplines. Too often these relationships are weak, with no clearly affixed responsibility for seeing that the programs for teachers tie academic substance to the problems of teaching these subjects to the diverse young people that make up our society. Similarly, respectable teacher education programs require up-to-date and reality-oriented scholars and teacher educators. This reality orientation must have a firm base in current educational research and development. We do know some things about effective schools today that we did not know in the late seventies, which leads to my third point regarding the professional knowledge base for teacher education.

Before moving to this third point, let me indicate that Federal assistance on the order of the capitation grants referred to earlier could also stimulate needed shifts in the desired direction of defensible academic standards and relationships. If institutions had to demonstrate subject matter competence as well as ongoing research and development activity with solid and cooperative linkages to schools and departments of education in order to qualify for capitation grant participation, the two-pronged need for individual talent and effective training programs could be melded together into a unified and complementary Federal effort.

When high quality teacher education programs in various institutions is identified and rewarded, it would enable us to demonstrate clearly and obviously to our public school community and to the public generally that recipients of quality programs have high level teaching and subject matter skills and knowledge. Such a capitation program could ultimately have a decided impact on general State teacher certification and State program approval requirements.

Another last problem I have chosen to address concerns the knowledge base of teacher education. Only a very small number, that is, perhaps a dozen or more, of the more than 1,200 teacher training institutions are seriously engaged in seeking to expand the professional knowledge base for teaching and teacher education [Guba & Clark, 1979, 1981]. Yet the strength of every profession is largely dependent upon the strength of its knowledge base. Though we know that research and development is not the answer, for there is no single answer, we do know that it is a necessary condition for advancements in any field of professional practice. The field of teaching is no different.

Studies of effective schools and studies of effective teaching are beginning to reveal important findings that should advance our effectiveness in teacher and administrator education. The field of educational inquiry is young; it is undersupported; and it is struggling to overcome unfounded criticism of its accomplishments. Commonsense alone tells us that better understanding of the problems and successes of teaching and schooling give us direction as to the ways and means of improving our systems of education.

You have noted by this time that the familiar problems I have cited and the possible solutions I have suggested all require fiscal resources in order to be effected. I recognize that the economic climate does not hold promise for educational renewal and improvement—especially without a Sputnik or a Conant. But education, like medicine, can be a matter of life and death—not only for an individual but for a great Nation as well. If the teachers and schools of other industrial nations pass America by in their ability to educate their young for a highly technical and sophisticated labor force and society, we may come to make teacher education and its undergirding knowledge base a priority—whether or not our budget is tight. We can get talented persons into teaching programs, and we can provide challenging and demanding education programs for them; but in this day and age we will have to pay for it. I hope this subcommittee will help make these matters a current priority of Federal attention.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Mr. CORRIGAN. Nancy.

STATEMENT OF NANCY QUISENBERRY, SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, CARBONDALE, ILL.

Ms. QUISENBERRY. Mr. Simon and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to have this opportunity. Being last on the panel, I run the risk of repeating what has been said, but I think that will just reinforce the needs that we see as vital to teacher education today.

I would like to address some of the problems in teacher training if we are to stand off the critical problem cited here.

The first is the professional nature of teacher education. Teacher education has to be treated as a profession.

For instance law schools, medical schools, professional schools receive adequate financial resources for supervision of interns and field work for doctors and lawyers. That is not true in teacher education.

We do need to have our students in the field experiencing what they are learning about in the classroom. This takes funding.

One of the things I see facing us is the adequate funding of teacher education as a profession.

In support of this need, I would also like to mention that we need to look at those areas that have formerly been funded by the Federal Government in support of education. One thing that comes to mind is the work we have built from funding through the National Science Foundation, which is not always recognized as an educational endeavor.

It is those kind of tie-ins that the Federal Government can support which will make a difference in the things that can happen in teacher education in the next few years.

A second point I would like to address has been addressed by other panel members, but I would like to build on it in a different way.

There are many areas of teacher education where new expertise and the research which has been cited are known. We have a greater knowledge base at this point than ever imagined 20 years ago in the field of education.

We need funding now to implement those ideas. One cannot just turn over books, magazines, journal articles, to faculty, and believe all the ideas will come out in the way the researchers have found they need to be implemented.

Two areas I know most of the colleges of education are working on, are in the area of training our regular education teachers for working with the handicapped, trying to meet the mandates of Public Law 94-142.

Another area is trying to prepare our teachers for the cultural diversity which exists in this Nation. In order to do this, we need continued funding as in the dean's grants. In Southern Illinois University, it has allowed us to infuse our program in a way that we could not have done in Iowa with our own State funding.

We have been able to incorporate into our total teacher training program information for all students who will go to the public schools dealing with handicapped youngsters in the classrooms. They are trained to handle these children in a regular classroom setting.

I would encourage you to look for continued funding that can infuse colleges of education, that recognize changes that must be made in order to train teachers adequately so they can continue to do this.

One of the criticisms is that our faculty does not go back into the classrooms enough; that they do not keep up with the reality of the real world of education.

Again, lack of funding at all levels prevents many colleges of education from supporting the kind of work we would like to have our faculty do in the classrooms. Federal funding allows us to move our faculty back into the classroom in other ways. Without this funding, this problem could become more acute.

Two funded programs we had last year were terminated last summer. One was a large CETA grant, which allowed us to train paraprofessionals and through that training move instruction to people who are included in training elementary and secondary teachers back in classrooms, working with teachers and paraprofessionals.

Another large grant was special education. A number of our special education faculty were actively involved in classrooms as a result of that grant. This kind of interaction also puts our faculty back into the classroom for dissemination of information and research in a way we are often not able to do otherwise and in a way locally funded grants often cannot disseminate.

A third area I would like to mention is the problem we are seeing in our State, and from talking to the others in most of the States, the very tight State budgets. What this means is that we are facing a reduction in money for staff and resources not only at the Federal level if grant moneys are not available but also at the State level. This again will impact upon us as we try to implement new strategies and methodologies into our teacher education program.

Finally, I would like to address the problem of future teachers in our schools. I think we are all concerned about the future and what will happen.

I think a concentrated effort is needed at all levels to publicize the good aspects of education and the good things that are happening in public schools. Most of what we read in the newspapers and some of the popular journals would have us believe all is bad. Those of us who visit classrooms on a regular basis to see student teachers or coordinators or supervisors in the field know there is a lot of good teaching taking place out there in spite of the handicaps all teachers face.

So, one of the things we need to do at all levels is to generate publicity and talk about the good things that are happening.

The second thing is the need for parent and public education on the role of the school. Without the support of parents and the public, particularly our large senior citizen group who have no children or grandchildren in the public schools, we do not have the support needed at the State and local levels. So, we need an extensive plan for educating the parents and the public. This may have to come about through funding at a higher than local level. We need to know how to do this effectively with the impact we want on the public.

As long as we have the problem that teachers leave 4-year programs at salaries so much below the salaries of students going out of other 4-year programs such as engineering, pharmacy, and what have you, I think we will continue to have the difficulty of recruiting good students.

I personally do not feel in our situation that the students we have are so much worse than they were a few years ago.

In reference to your first question, I would like to say looking at data tells you different things. I do agree with Dr. Lanier that we should be concerned with test data but, for example, last week we were comparing ACT scores of entering students, math majors with math education majors. There was relatively little difference. In some cases, in one major, the liberal arts person might be slightly higher, and in another case, the ed group might be slightly higher.

So, it depends on how you are looking at the data and breaking it out. You cannot expect generalists to be specialists and to test high in specialized areas. So, we need to look at that in different ways.

But back to my point: In order to have students interested in being teachers, we need to find ways to support the excellent work that is done. There have to be some incentives. Sabbaticals have been mentioned. I think sabbaticals are necessary not only as an incentive but to reduce burnout and stress.

In other words, we need incentives which will not only bring students into the field but will keep them there. We need students in our State in agriculture, foreign language, and science and vocational ed. Recruitment does not seem to work. Students feel they can get a higher salary at being something other than a teacher.

I do believe that we are going to have to look back at some programs that have worked in the past. This relates to something Dr. Lanier has said, the idea of scholarships, perhaps a different loan system for people who go into teacher ed, even those whose families make higher incomes, which is something we are feeling right now, a pinch, in order to get these people into our education programs.

Finally, I would like to make a point that many colleges and schools of education do provide good training programs given the restriction of doing this in a 4-year program and 120 semester hours. Many schools are not restricted to 120, but ours is restricted to 120 hours. There is only so much that one can do in a program that is limited. I believe it will take Federal intervention and consideration to look at the possibility of 5-year programs.

Right now the incentives for universities to look at extended programs that will prepare teachers more completely than they are now prepared are not there. Students who are not paying for an education for 4 years to become a teacher certainly will not see incentives for 5 years.

We understand some of the problems that face us in terms of total preparation of the teacher for their first year on the job, but we also have these other factors which we must consider.

Mr. CORRIGAN. In conclusion, I would like to present eight recommendations to this committee:

First, stimulate the expansion and enhancement of the "talent pool" of prospective teachers through a significant new merit-based fellowship/scholarship program to attract the most capable of students into teacher education;

Second, expand rather than eliminate the "forgiveness provisions" contained in the Federal student loan programs for talented students in teacher education; and consider "capitation grants" to high-quality institutions and a model analogous to the Public Health Service grants to talented students;

Third, assure that your colleagues on the Appropriations Committee assign priority to and commit resources to building capacity within schools, colleges, and departments of education to meet the crises of shortage in quality—funding of the Weiss provisions [section 533] of the Education Amendments of 1980 [Public Law 96-374] would facilitate this recommendation;

Fourth, provide Federal incentives and support for research, development, and dissemination in the area of teaching and learning, and for capacity building in fields identified as high national priorities through increased support for the National Institute of Education.

We also believe Federal incentives should be provided to promote some of the demonstrations already underway. Programs such as in the University of Kansas 5-year model where they are stressing a good, strong liberal education with good, strong specialization in a discipline with a good professional component with demonstrated competence before entering into teaching.

We have never had the life space to prepare a competent person who is safe to place with their clients upon entering the profession of teacher education.

You said in your opening remarks—you can make the same statement about what happens in terms of preparing most other professionals. Veterinarians, it takes 8 years to prepare a veterinarian in this country, and we try to prepare a teacher for the most complex job imaginable in 4 years. We seem to be more interested in our cattle, oftentimes, than we are in our children.

So, we would hope new ideas may be stimulated and the symbolic support may be as important as the money.

We would also like to suggest that the Federal role could be to stimulate the local education agencies and State agencies through block grants.

Fifth, stimulate both LEA's and SEA's to give serious attention to the need to build continuous professional development programs for teaching personnel development programs for teaching personnel—using successful teacher corps/teacher centers modules as they implement the block grant authorization. This would take new strategies for collaboration since 80 percent of the block grants will be used by the local education agencies. We have to develop some totally new strategies on how we put these funds together to make a maximum impact on this problem.

For instance in Texas we have over 1,100 individual school districts. Just to have that 80 percent block grant money to go out to those 1,100 districts without any kind of strategy for pooling it so you can have maximum impact on the problems we have identified, it will take some work.

Sixth, we would also like to encourage the strengthening of the National Center of Educational Statistics authorization that call upon the center to undertake appropriate supply-demand surveys of educational personnel and other relevant studies.

We have a lot of data on declining enrollment, but I think it would be very significant—we just did the study in Texas in terms of the number of teachers who have given a choice for another occupation, we found over 50 percent of the teachers studied would be choosing a different occupation if they were starting over again. The morale situation—if you take the declining numbers going into teacher education programs, the numbers leaving, and the new baby boom birthrate just in terms of live birthrate last year in Texas we will need 985 new first grade teachers by 1985. A lot of people are not looking at that increase in the live birthrate.

We also believe we ought to provide these legislative incentives in the special areas identified by the panel. We believe that front-end moneys need to be provided for staff development. We firmly believe that the schools and colleges of education, if given the opportunity, will gear up and meet the kind of problems we have identified here today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Dean Corrigan et al., follows:]

Prepared Statement of Dean C. Corrigan, Gwendolyn Baker, Judith Lanier, Nancy Quisenberry, and Mary Christian, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Mr. Chairman, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Education and Labor Committee. We appreciate Chairman Simon's willingness to hold these public hearings, particularly during this time of uncertainty about the future of federal support for education personnel development.

For the past 125 years the Association and its predecessor organizations, including the American Normal School Association (1858), the North Central Council of State Normal School Presidents and Principals (1902), and the American Association of Teachers Colleges (1917), have represented the interests and concerns of higher education institutions engaged in educational personnel development and educational research in this country. The Association consists of more than 770 collegiate institutions in all states as well as Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and the

District of Columbia. Its member institutions produce approximately 90 percent of the newly licensed school personnel each year.

I currently serve as the President of the Association while holding the position of Dean, College of Education, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas. Other members of our panel include Gwendolyn Baker, Vice President of Graduate & Childrens Program Division, Bank Street College of Education, New York; Mary Christian, Director, School of Education, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia; and Judith Lanier, Dean, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan; and Nancy Quisenberry, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Our comments today will focus on the theme identified by you, Mr. Chairman, as the problems and prospects of teacher education. We recognize that this committee has no pending legislation pertaining to teacher education and perhaps sees this hearing as predecent setting in its scope. We would only note that the Association was a petitioner before the 71st Congress some 50 years ago, and that similar concerns by members of that era led to the commissioning of a six volume national survey of the education of teachers under the auspices of the Department of the Interior. That survey serves today as a useful source of baseline information for assessing our achievements in the field of teacher education. Other Congresses have given careful scrutiny to the matter of teacher education—perhaps because of the critical relationship between the education of children and youth and the maintenance and enhancement of our democratic society. During the 96th Congress, Representative Weiss continued this tradition with his development of the Schools of Education Assistance Act, an amendment to the Higher Education Act.

Direct Congressional involvement in teacher education began with the Nelson Amendment to the Morrill Act of 1907, which authorized land grant institutions to use federal funding for vocational and agricultural teacher education. Amendments to the Smith-Hughes Act a decade later extended this mandate. Subsequent legislation passed during the Eisenhower years established the National Science Foundation, authorized the National Defense Education Act and created the Cooperative Research Act. Included were significant resources for teacher training at schools of education, curriculum development, and research and development activities.

From both historical and philosophical perspectives, the education of children and youth is the fundamental bulwark maintaining and improving a democratic society. Qualified and highly competent teachers are critical to the educational process which ensures that the citizenry of a democracy reaches its highest potential intellectually, socially, morally, economically, and physically. The role of teacher educators, therefore, is particularly significant both to the welfare of a democratic society and to the education of its children and youth. Their preparation, their performance, and their example should exemplify the goals and ideals which will be taught to the children and youth who determine the quality of societal life in future years. To ignore or neglect the role of teacher educators in this dynamic cycle of events is to ignore or neglect the welfare of society itself.

The following set of principles are included in this testimony to assist you in understanding the recommendations and concerns of teacher educators.

1. Teacher education is the preparation and research arm of the teaching profession.
2. Like other professional programs, the teacher preparation program is most effective when it is located on the campus of a significant college or university. Here it can have the advantage of the scholarly environment which fosters research and creative activities; as well as access to the rich opportunities for liberal learning, teaching specializations in the disciplines, the social and behavioral sciences and humanities which undergird the profession of teaching, the privilege of academic freedom in the pursuit of truth and effectiveness, and the rich, cultural environment that pervails.
3. The process of educating persons to be teachers transforms them from lay citizens to professional educators. The role performance of the teacher will be importantly altered during the preparation process.
4. While recognizing the importance of a liberal education and of specialization in one or more teaching fields, nothing should obscure the fact that the difference between an educated person and a professional teacher is pedagogy—the science of teaching.
5. Teacher educators exemplify what they teach. The professional college or school can be no less than a model of the best educational practice known to the profession and society; i.e., philosophy, instructional strategies and performance, organization, facilities, equipment and resources, experimentation, and innovation.

Jonathan Messerli's (1974) biography of Horace Mann describes problems which have troubled teacher education since the founding of the normal schools in New

England a century and a half ago. According to Mann, an atmosphere of public "ignorance, bigotry and economy" surrounded the Framingham Normal School and other early Massachusetts normal schools from their inception. As our testimony will point out, those same conditions have prevailed throughout much of the history of teacher education in America. During much of the 19th century, formal training of elementary school teachers in the U.S. was conducted in two-year normal schools. The liberal arts colleges then incorporated pedagogics into their programs in response to the need for secondary school teachers. Pedagogy was first incorporated into a university in 1873, and graduate work in education was first offered in 1890. With the change of the Michigan State Normal School to the Michigan State Teachers College in 1897, the beginning of the demise of the old normal school pattern for training teachers began.

Subsequently, the network of teachers colleges in the U.S. began expanding their curricula and adding new programs leading to the emergence of state colleges and universities. During the same period established universities were adding colleges or schools of education.

These developments in teacher education during the past 150 years are critical to an understanding of the condition of teacher education today. We must still cope with inadequate resources, misinformation, and a prevailing condescension on the part of others—particularly within the academy.

A second component contributing to the present condition of teacher education is the precarious attempt to fuse together three separate traditions and philosophies concerning teacher education: that of the normal school, liberal arts college, and university graduate school. The normal school placed emphasis on teaching methodology; the liberal arts college, on the content of the disciplines; and the universities, on research about teaching and learning.

Teacher education is now an integral part of higher education, but the perception remains that it is still conducted in the old normal school pattern. We should note that both settings—normal schools and higher education institutions—have distinct advantages and disadvantages. While training programs in normal schools were shorter (usually two years) and focused primarily on pedagogy, they had the advantage of incorporating a variety of needed field work in their programs and maintaining close ties to the schools in their environs. In higher education institutions, teacher education programs are subject to restrictions limiting the amount of pedagogy and field work in the curriculum, yet they have the advantage of drawing on the university's full resources—a range of academic disciplines, research and development, library resources—and of being part of four-year degree programs.

In the final analysis the improvement of teacher education programs results by eliminating the disadvantages of both the normal school and higher education settings and incorporating the advantages of both.

CHARACTERISTICS AND CONCERNS

Today the preparation of teachers, counselors, principals, and school administrators takes place in some 1,400 institutions of higher education (IHEs) from Harvard to Los Angeles State University and from Pacific Lutheran College to Florida Agriculture and Mechanical University. More than seventy percent of all IHEs provide teacher education programs, although the largest share of new personnel (45 percent) are trained in public masters-level state colleges and universities that have as a part of their legacy a tradition of pedagogical emphasis. The accompanying data, drawn from the work of Clark and Guba at Indiana University, details the spread and diversity of such programs and the difficulty of dealing with charges of alleged proliferation of programs and institutions.

SOURCE: "Demographics of Teacher Education: Implications for Policymaking." Ralph Cyr. In Policy for the Education of Educators: Issues and _Implications_. Washington: AACTE, 1981

Estimated Numbers of Education Degrees Granted by SCDEs
and Estimated Numbers of SCDE Faculty
by RITE Institutional Categories

Category	Population	Percent of Population	Education Degrees		SCDE Faculty	
			Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
1	113	8.2	91,450	28.8	11,380	33.6
2	51	3.7	18,475	5.8	1,568	4.6
3	247	18.0	134,437	42.3	15,051[a]	44.5
4	38	2.3	6,962	2.2	N.A.	N.A.
5	280	20.4	31,062	9.8	2,503	7.4
6	66	4.8	9,312	2.9	807[b]	2.4
7	26	1.9	1,800	.6	N.A.	N.A.
8	556	40.6	24,112	7.6	2,532	7.5

[a] Combined with Category 4

[b] Combined with Category 7

KEY

Category	
1	Public Doctoral Level Institutions
2	Private Doctoral Level Institutions
3.	Public Masters Level Institutions, Main Campus
4.	Public Regional Masters Institutions
5	Private Masters Level Institutions
6	Public Bachelors Level Institutions, Main Campus
7	Public Regional Bachelors Level Institutions
8	Private Bachelors Level Institutions

Joyce, Yarger and Howey (1977) documented that 41,000 persons teach in these programs, collectively known as schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDEs). Their data showed 85 percent of these persons held doctorates; 60 percent were tenured; more than 90 percent had significant work experience in elementary and secondary schools (with a mean of 8 years of such service).

They also found a largely white male, largely campus-bound faculty (not engaging in off-campus consultancies) who placed primary emphasis on their teaching assignments. Ladd and Lipset (1975) found this same faculty more supportive of campus activism, black concerns, and student participation than the average faculty member, although its self-perception was one of considerable conservatism.

Perhaps the most pervasive and serious problem confronting SCDEs has been the decline in enrollment and the attendant curtailment of programs and retrenchment of faculty. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (1980) documents that enrollments in education have fallen from 1.118 million in 1966 to 781 thousand in 1978, while the National Education Association (NEA) (1981) reports that education productivity decreased from an all-time high level of 317,254 in 1972 to 159,485 in 1980—a decrease of 49.7 percent.

The student enrollment in education exhibits characteristics long associated with the public school teacher. More than two-thirds are female; almost 90 percent are white; the majority come from middle class homes (one-third of their mothers are homemakers); fifty percent attended universities and colleges approximately fifty miles from home; and a quarter transferred into their present program from a community or junior college. The composite of the preservice teacher candidate described by Joyce et al. is consistent with historic patterns.

One of the persistent myths regarding teacher education programs is that students spend all of their time in professional education courses. In reality students preparing to teach spend more time studying liberal arts areas outside the school of education—language, literature, humanities, mathematics, natural and social sciences, etc.—than in teacher education. Professional study comprises only 41 percent of an elementary school teacher's program and 30 percent of a secondary program.

One of the major problems confronting teacher education is the lack of adequate time to teach pedagogy during the course of a four-year bachelor's program. While there has been an explosion of knowledge in the last 30 years in areas of teaching and learning, there has been a corresponding decline in the amount of of time to prepare teachers utilizing that knowledge. The following tables (Smith and Street, 1980) compare the growth and decline of quarter hours of student preparation for careers in teaching, law, pharamacy and civil engineering.

Table 1. Preparation Required in Secondary Education, English, University of Florida (Quarter Hours)

	1929	1939	1949	1959	1969	1979
Coursework taken outside professional school*	148	155	146	141	143	145
Coursework taken within professional school**	50	30	41	45	45	43
Percent of total course work taken within the professional school	25	16	22	24	24	23
Years required for degree	4	4	4	4	4	4
Total graduation credits	198	185	187	186	188	188

All figures represent minimum amounts of credit hours needed to meet requirements.

** Includes general education courses and upper-division electives and requirements taken outside the professional school.*

***Includes coursework offered within the professional school and lower-division requirements labeled with the lettered prefix of the professional school.*

Table 2. Preparation Required in Elementary Education, University of Florida (Quarter Hours)

	1939	1949	1959	1969	1979
Coursework taken outside professional school*	96	127	141	122	122
Coursework taken within professional school**	90	59	54	66	70
Percent of total course-work taken in professional preparation	48	32	28	35	36
Years required for degree	4	4	4	4	4
Total graduation credits	186	186	195	188	192

All figures represent minimum amounts of credit hours needed to meet requirements.

**Includes general education courses and upper-division electives and requirements taken outside the professional school.*

***Includes coursework offered within the professional school and lower-division requirements labeled with the lettered prefix of the professional school.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4. Preparation Required in College of Law,
University of Florida (Quarter Hours)

	1929	1939	1949	1959	1969	1979
General Education	102	141	135	192	192	186
Professional coursework	128	128	128	128	126	126
Percent of total coursework taken in professional preparation	57	48	49	40	40	40
Years required for degree	5	6	6	7	7	7
Total graduation credits	230	269	263	320	318	312

All figures represent minimum amounts of credit hours needed to meet requirements

**Based on minimum requirements for an Arts and Sciences degree at the University of Florida.*

Table 5. Preparation Required in the College of Pharmacy,
University of Florida (Quarter Hours)

	1929	1939	1949	1959	1969	1979
Coursework taken outside professional school*	111	105	104	122	134	123
Coursework taken within professional school**	93	104	102	101	104	114
Percent of total coursework in professional courses	46	50	50	45	44	48
Years required for degree	4	4	4	4	5	5
Total graduation credits	204	209	206	223	238	237

All figures represent minimum amounts of credit hours needed to meet requirements.

**Includes general education courses and upper-division electives and requirements taken outside the professional school.*

***Includes coursework offered within the professional school and lower-division requirements labeled with the lettered prefix of the professional school.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6. Preparation Requirements in the College of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Florida (Quarter Hours)

	1929	1939	1949	1959	1969	1979
Courses taken outside professional school	120	119	104	125	107	90
Courses taken within professional school	98	107	120	117	106	112
Percent of coursework taken in professional subjects	45	47	54	48	50	55
Years required for degree	4	4(5)	4(5)	4(5)	4(5)	4(5)
Total graduation credits	218	226	224	242	213	202

All figures are expressed in terms of minimum number of hours required for graduation.

"Experience has shown that the average student requires five years for graduation," states the 1939 catalogue. Thus, while the curriculum is a four-year program, most students required five years to complete it.

The 1959-60 catalogue states that "the curricula for all departments in the College of Engineering have been established on a five-year basis." However, it states that "accelerated" students may graduate in less time.

The 1969 catalogue states that the curriculum could be completed in 12 quarters, but that "the majority of students will require at least 13 quarters.

In 1979 the catalogue says, "The aggressive, strongly motivated student" can complete the curriculum in 13 quarters, but "the majority of students will require more than 13 quarters."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Many outstanding schools of education are currently experimenting with extended programs of preparation. The separation between subject matter and pedagogy has long been a major concern of both critics and supporters of teacher education. Efforts to build continuity and coordination between these two, often disparate program elements cause many to argue that teacher education is an all-university responsibility. The Council for Basic Education (Basic Education, June 1981 issue) builds the case as follows:

"Pedagogy is the proper business of Doctors of Education, and it is proper for them to cede to the Doctors of Philosophy responsibility for the subjects of content of school teaching. Propriety, however, is no guarantee of quality programs of teachers preparation. It does nothing to ensure either the right kind or the right amount of pedagogy and subject preparation, to say nothing of their effective coordination."

Perhaps the most notable change in teacher education during the last decade has been the growth in the clinical experiences segment of teacher training—as measured in both academic credit hours and clock hours. The National Survey on Preservice Preparation of Teachers (1977) showed an increased of four credit hours and 50 clock hours (from 275 to 325) since 1963—and concluded that this change increases the opportunities for academic concepts to be applied to real school situations.

SCDEs use a variety of admission and retention policies and procedures to influence directly the quality of personnel being prepared to teach. However, admission to a college or university is the first step in the selection process of who shall be prepared to teach. Teacher educators have little, if any, control over this step.

Decisions regarding who shall be admitted to a teacher education program are the responsibility of teacher educators. Such decisions are based on standard measures like grade point averages, personal interviews, standardized test scores, letters of reference, etc. Admission to a teacher education program, however, is only one phase of the selection process. Candidates for teacher preparation generally must demonstrate, at a number of specific points during the preparation program, that they possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and values for successful professional practice. Decisions regarding whether or not a candidate is retained in a preparation program should be made periodically; unfortunately this does not occur in every program.

In addition, teacher education may need to make special efforts to ensure not only the quality of teacher preparation candidates, but also to ensure that the cadre of candidates reflects the diversity of the population base of American society.

While we acknowledge that the quality of teacher education programs varies widely among the colleges and universities in the United States, efforts are being made through accreditation and program approval processes to ensure greater uniformity of quality for all teacher education programs.

The program for the initial preparation of teachers generally includes several components:

1. A strong foundation of general education courses and experiences providing exposure to the various academic disciplines making up the school curriculm—the humanities, languages, sciences, mathematics, social sciences, and the arts. The contents of this component are usually stated as college/university graduation requirements; teacher educators generally do not have control over what the contents will be.
2. Studies in the social and behavioral sciences (psychology, human growth and development, anthropology, sociology) and their application to the practice of education.
3. A specialization component which provides a strong indepth study of a teaching field or fields. Specific knowledge and skills to be acquired usually are defined by college/university major requirements. The requirements, however, should allow time in the teaching major to accomodate the preparation needed for teaching particuarly at the secondary school level.
4. A component providing generic pedagogical knowledge and skills in assessing, diagnosing, and interpreting students' learning needs; planning and prescribing instruction; conducting/implementing instruction; evaluating instructional outcomes; classroom management; human relations skills; conferral/referral skills; knowledge and skills related to population-specific characteristics; institutional citizenship; and professional citizenship.
5. Specific pedagogical knowledge and skills for teaching specific subjects and for specific age or grade levels.
6. Clinical and practicum experiences which bridge theory and practice. This component includes observation and analysis of classroom teaching; laboratory and clinical experiences; practicum/student teaching; and an internship. It is not as-

sumed that clinical and practicum experiences will be concentrated into only one culminating experience near the end of the preparation program. Rather, it is assumed that such experiences will be provided throughout the preparation program at appropriate times, beginning with observation and analysis and leading to full responsibility for classroom teaching, under the supervision of qualified personnel.

Funding for teacher education is a major concern. Peseau and Orr (1980) recently completed a study which concluded that more is spent educating a typical third-grader ($1,400) than training a teacher ($927). At the same time, according to these same researchers within the university, the average expenditure per equivalent full-time student is $2,363. The fact is that teacher education is a revenue-producing program, which explains in part why it is offered by so many institutions of higher education. As recently as 1977, teacher education generated 11 percent of all university student credit hour production and in return, received less than three percent of the institution's programmatic resources.

The use of weighted student credit hour measures as the quantitative determinant for the distribution of resources within universitites is a major source of concern, particularly when SCDEs are expected to conduct an extensive array of outreach or service programs for school districts. Such activities typically do not generate credit hours and, therefore, do not qualify for university allocations. Certain states have recognized this constraint and "topped-up" or freed certain percentages of funds for schools of education to conduct workshops, seminars, or assessment activities for local education agencies.

At the same time, complexity formulas have determined that the preparation of teachers is a less complex task than, for example, the preparation of a nurse or veterinarian. This continues to leave teacher education in an untenable position. While we do not believe there should be one-to-one allotment of dollars to academic programs for dollars generated by those programs, we do believe that a better balance must be achieved between various productivity measures and budgets for teacher education.

A problematical myth is that all persons enrolled in teacher education programs intended to become public school teachers. Decade-long supply-demand studies have assumed that all students preparing to teach should be counted in the potential supply column. Although in actuality as many as 20 percent of those enrolled never intend to seek certification or enter the teaching force. It has only recently become recognized that schools of education have a long tradition of preparing persons for other jobs—so called noneducation jobs—and doing so with considerable success. In part, because of this phenomena, graduates newly qualified to teach fare better in the total labor market than those arts and science graduates not qualified to teach.

QUALITY CONTROLS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Unlike the case in many other countries, the quality of the initial preparation of teachers in the U.S. is not controlled by a national ministry of education. While a centralized approach to quality control might result in greater uniformity among the approximately 1,400 teacher education programs in the country, the approved level of quality would likely be lower than what most educators and citizens would consider adequate for the preparation of teachers. The advantages of other approaches to quality control outweigh any advantage there might be in a national centralized plan conducted by the federal government.

Quality control of teacher education in the U.S. is multifacted in nature; it does not depend on the activity of any one agency or organization. The activities of single agency or organization are complemented by those of other groups. However, quality control of teacher education is hampered by the fact that not all facets of the overall process are as effective as they should be, as is noted below. Four facets of the quality control process deserve mentioning here.

1. National accreditation of teacher education

Unique to the U.S., accreditation is a process self-imposed by educational institutions to ensure quality control. Two basic types of accreditation are practiced: institutional, and program-specific, with the former being a prerequisite to the latter. Accreditation of teacher education is the program-specific type. Less than half (537) of the 1,400 higher education institutions are currently accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The Council represents colleges and universities through AACTE, classroom teachers through NEA, and others through 11 organizations and associations which also have a stake in the preparation of teachers. The evaluation of a teacher education program is made every seven years on the basis of a detailed institutional report and an on-site visit by an evaluation team. While accreditation by NCATE is not mandatory, an increasing number of colleges and universities are seeking the stamp of approval by this national accrediting body. If accreditation were mandatory, as some argue that it should be, one would expect that the quality of teacher education programs generally would be improved.

2. State approval of teacher education programs

Included in the responsibilities of state education agencies is the task of ensuring that institutions of higher education which prepare teachers in their states meet certain quality standards. Colleges and universities must obtain the approval of the state department of education (or the professional standards Commission, as is true in a few states) before offering teacher education programs. On the surface this appears to be a sound approach to quality control. While the several states have made progress in making their separate standards more uniform, there remains the serious problem of implementing their application. Few, if any, colleges or universities fail to obtain some form of approval for operating teacher education programs. Rather than deny approval, state departments of education often issue to the programs renewable, temporary one-year approvals in response to pressures from state legislators. State approval of teacher education programs, therefore, is often made on the basis of politics rather than of program quality.

3. Certification of teacher education graduates for entry into the profession

Unlike the first three facets of quality control, which are concerned with program quality, certification is the process where an individual is judged to meet the minimum standards of competence in the profession of teaching. Licensing is the legal process of permitting persons to practice the profession. This responsibility, too, is carried on by state departments of education. The express purpose of certification is to ensure that only qualified persons are permitted to teach. In practice, the certification process often involves little more than reading a candidate's transcript to verify that certain prescribed requirements (usually courses) have been met. The assumption is that meeting the requirements means competence. As is too well known, this does not always follow.

A serious quality control problem in the certification process is the flexibility which state departments of education exercise in times of teacher shortages. States can and do certify unqualified candidates when the demand for teachers exceeds the supply of qualified candidates. This practice seriously undermines efforts to maintain quality control over who is certified to teach.

Another facet of this process, which touches on other interests of this subcommittee, is the use of standardized tests as an integral part of the certification process. Ten states now have various systems of testing prospective teachers and 33 more have pending legislation to put in place minimal competency measures. These measures do not guarantee quality teachers.

ISSUES CONFRONTING TEACHER EDUCATION

Societal expectations

During the past 30 years, schools have increasingly been used as instruments for social change through a combination of shifts in general societal expectations, legislative mandates, and court decisions. As a result, schools still are held responsible for developing the basic skills and knowledge that has been their traditional domain, but they have also been given responsibility for implementing solutions to problems ranging from nutrition and health to desegregation. While it appears that there may be less consensus about the propriety of such roles than there has been in the past, the multiple expectations of the schools has added to the difficulty of training teachers.

Changing clientele

From 1930 to 1980, schools and teacher training institutions have been called upon to serve a student clientele that has undergone rapid changes in numbers, composition, and characteristics. The well-known "baby boom" that the United States experienced during the 1940s and 1950's resulted in a rapid and pronounced need for schools and school personnel during the 1950s and 1960s.

Except for a short interruption during World War II, births in the United States increased dramatically, until about 1959; then, equally dramatically they began to decrease. In 1935, 2.38 million babies were born; by 1950; that number had risen to 3.63 million, reaching a peak of 4.268 million births in 1961. By 1965, however, the number of births had already dropped to 3.76 million and to a low of 3.15 million births in 1975.

Schools were forced to quickly accommodate these rapidly changing numbers. From 1950 to 1965, school districts built schools, hired teachers and expanded programs to accommodate ever-larger classes. By the time they had fully adjusted to the larger numbers, the pattern of the birth rate and the number of births had reversed—each entering class was steadily smaller. Since the late 1960s, education has been trying to adjust to those smaller numbers, and to make decisions about how to use—or eliminate—a surplus of buildings, programs and personnel.

Ironically, since 1975 the birth rates and number of births have once more reversed and have risen annually. School districts and teacher training programs are faced with a new quandry: is the increase a short-term one, to be followed by a return to low numbers of births and birth rates, or is it the beginning of a longer term cycle of increased births?

According to the most recent Bureau of the Census data (current Pop. Rep., P-20, No. 362, May, 1981), the following data and trends currently prevail in school enrollment:

1. As of October, 1980, about 57.3 million persons three to 34 years old were enrolled in school. There was a significant increase in preprimary enrollments but no significant change in college enrollments from 1979 to 1980.
2. Elementary school enrollment in 1980 (27.4 million) was about one-fifth below the 1970 figure, resulting from the decline in the elementary school age population. Since 1977, however, the number of births has been climbing slowly, bringing a projected end to the declining elementary enrollment in the next few years.
3. Private elementary school enrollment declined in the decade, mostly in the early years of the decade. In 1980, about 11 percent of elementary school students attended private schools, not significantly different from the proportion in 1970 but significantly less than the 15 percent in 1975.
4. Total high school enrollment of 14.6 million in 1980 exhibited a one-year decline of about 560,000 students. There has been a decline of at least one million students in high school since the 1975–77 period when enrollment remained around 15.7 million. This decline is the result of the population decline in the eligible high school age group.

Not only have numbers of students changed, but their composition and characteristics have changed as well:

1. In 1932, 302 of every 1,000 students who had been in fifth grade in 1924-25 graduated from high school; by 1977, 744 of the students who had been fifth-graders in the fall of 1969 graduated. Thus, schools increased their holding power by about 268 percent, and while doing so, broadened the range of the type of student being served. (Digest of Education Statistics, 1979, Table 10)
2. Between 1960 and 1977, the percentage of children living with a separated parent doubled from nine to 18 percent (7.1 million to 11.3 million), and the percentage living with a divorced parent tripled. The number living with a never-married parent was seven times as high; there was a 10 percent decline in the number of children living with two parents (from 56.3 million to 50.8 million). (From Paul Glick, "The Future of the American Family," Bureau of the Census, 1978.)
3. Increasing racial and ethnic diversity requires that schools be able to respond to a wider range of interests, needs and backgrounds. Immigration, which accounts for one-fourth of net population growth in the United States (Coates, 1979), places increasing language-related demands upon schools, especially in metropolitan areas.
4. During the 1950s and 1960s, family size increased and a higher percentage of later-borns than first-borns were produced. According to some theorists (Zajonc, 1976), birth order effects the amount of adult attention the child receives, which in turn has an influence on student intelligence and academic performance; thus birth order could be accountable for some of the drop in scores that occurred during the 1960s and 1970s.

Teacher demographics

1. The supply of teachers in the United States has closely corresponded to a combination of two factors—the well-publicized demand for teachers during the 1950s as the baby boom moved through the schools, and the coming of college age to the baby boom, which resulted in increased numbers and percentages of college age youth entering and completing college.
2. Teacher supply and demand seems to respond well, although in a delayed fashion, to the general marketplace. Between 1975 and 1977 the number of new graduates qualified to teach decreased from about 243,000 to 190,200 in 1977, a decrease of 22 percent. (NCES, New Teachers in the Job Market, p. 3)

3. In 1976, 84 percent of the 243,000 1974-75 graduates qualified to teach applied for teaching jobs; 54 percent of all graduates or 132,200 received positions, either full-time or part-time. By 1978, the percentage of eligible new teachers seeking teaching positions decreased to 77 percent; 60 percent of all graduates, or 113,300 received full-time or part-time teaching positions. In 1975, 65 percent of those who sought teaching positions found them; in 1978, 77 percent of those who applied for a teaching position obtained one. (NCES, N. Teachers, pp. 9-100). This compares favorably with other bachelor's degree recipients as a group in the labor market of 1978. NCES reports that newly qualified teachers are currently at least as successful in obtaining jobs as are persons in most other fields.

4. Equilibrium between demand for supply of newly qualified elementary school teachers is expected by the middle of the 1980s; a shortage is expected by the end of the decade. The supply of newly qualified secondary school teachers is expected to continue to exceed demand throughout the 1980s. (Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Fall, 1980)

5. Opportunities within the teaching profession vary widely by field and by region of the country. According to the 1980 ASCUS Teacher Supply/Demand Report, there continues to be a great demand for teachers in the fields of mathematics, industrial arts, vocational, agriculture, and bilingual education, and to a somewhat lesser extent in special education and the physical sciences. Physical education, social sciences and health education were shown to be in the least demand. However, these vary by region, and a teacher's ability to be hired depends to a certain extent on his/her willingness to relocate to areas with teacher scarcity.

PROBLEMS THAT CONFRONT TEACHER EDUCATION

One problem that has had an impact on schools of education during the past several Congresses has been the apparent interest of the Federal government in building a series of alternative teacher education delivery systems. This was evident for the first time in 1965, with passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which significantly shifted Federal policy toward teacher education. For the first time, local education agencies (LEAs) were permitted to use Federal monies to initiate teacher development programs. In addition, in what some consider to have been the most important federal policy decision affecting schools of education, the Cooperative Research Act was amended to establish educational laboratories to develop and demonstrate educational innovations and to train teachers in their use. Finally, Teacher Corps legislation promoted a teacher-intern model in a school setting. Whereas earlier federal investments in teacher education had concentrated on building the capacity of SCDEs, these three Federal acts clearly moved teacher training, research, and development out of the historically exclusive domain of higher education.

These pieces of legislation, as well as the controversial Educational Professions Development Act of 1967 (EPDA), continued the pattern of role erosion for SCDEs as the primary educational training agency. EPDA was expected to consolidate some 15 discretionary programs for the purposes of program administration and local coordination. Teacher renewal sites were to become a local delivery system for the inservice training of teachers. While this effort was curtailed and the Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 84-482) repealed EPDA, federal policy further encouraged site-specific training through establishment of the Teacher Centers Program. By the end of 1976, the Federal investment in professional preparation was substantial—over $500 million in grants, contracts, and other awards through some 40 separate Office of Education-administered programs—with still more millions of dollars invested through a host of programs outside the Education Division. However, this money was shared among three role groups: institutions of higher education (IHEs), local education agencies (LEA's), and state education agencies (SEA's). Federal legislation, either by intent of benign neglect, had cast the current set of actors into the future of teacher education.

The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 included in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (P.L. 97-208) now moves this debate to a new level. It also presents schools of education with unique problems, because they have been the primary recipients of funds from the 33 categorical programs consolidated. SCDEs have developed a significant number of programs responsive to Federal funding opportunities, and now see their termination as a significant disruption. The "phasing-in" of the block grants will help to alleviate some of the abruptness of this move, but will not prevent the "laying off" of significant numbers of faculty and termination of graduate student fellowships, "overload curriculum."

A far more serious problem confronting schools of education is both the shortage and the quality of the talent pool of applications. Imig (1981), in a recent speech, highlighted this problem:

"In teacher education we have been asked to do the impossible. With meager resources, a lack of institutional commitment and limited time, schools of education are asked to produce ever more capable young men and women to deal with an increasing array of school problems. Today the challenge is to improve the qualify of a profession confronted by a host of problems. In all other professions there were efforts to improve salary levels before there were serious reform efforts designed to improve the quality of their practitioners; in education, schools of education are being asked to improve the quality of its graduates before we substantially increase remuneration for practicing teachers—and yet our expectations continue to grow.

Yet the evidence abounds that we have fallen short in attracting the best and most capable students into teacher education. Weaver (1981) has written much regarding the persistent and prolonged decline in the applicant pool of teacher education. SAT scores of 1980 high school seniors who planned to major in education were 48 points below the national average in math and 35 points below in the verbal component. He reported that college seniors in 1976 majoring in education ranked 14th of 16 college specialities on verbal measures and next to last on math scores. Recently students enrolled in education scored lowest of all college students on an examination of international literacy. What causes this decline is probably both a legacy of the collapse of the job market for teachers and the success of affirmative action programs. It also is attributable, as Cronin (1981) has recently written, to the fact that the nation gets approximately what it pays for, which is the bottom one-third of the college-going population, seeking positions paying salaries in the bottom one-third of the economy. Other reasons included:

(1) *Stress and burnout.*—stress has increased dramatically as schools have assumed greater responsibility for ameliorating social ills, while having less authority to carry them out; and,

(2) *Adverse publicity.*—a three-week Newsweek series and the April issue of New Republic stressed burnout, oversupply, problems of discipline and violence and inadequately trained teachers as reasons for the failure of the American public school, thereby raising even more doubts regarding the efficacy of the public school.

Today we are on the threshold of a major teacher shortage brought on by: (a) declining enrollments in SCDEs; (b) an upturn in the birthrate which will increase from 14.7 percent (1976) to 17.1 percent (1985) as large numbers of young women enter their childbearing years; (c) the simultaneous retirement of scores of teachers who were hired in the late 1950's to accommodate the Post-World War II baby boom; and (d) changes in employment opportunities for women in other fields, compounded by the increasing number of female teachers who are heads of families (and, necessarily, must move out of teaching to secure sufficient salaries).

While there is some uncertainty about the potential impact of the reserve pool of trained but unplaced teachers on this shortage, the most recent "Condition of Education" projects that by 1985 the supply of new teachers will fall short of demand—with significant shortages of new graduates in the late 1980s. Whether the reserve pool will significantly alleviate this shortage is uncertain.

Another overlooked but related fact is that the age group from which teachers traditionally are drawn will decrease by 25 percent during the next decade. This will force SCDEs to compete with other programs within the university, the military and the job market for potential applicants, at a time when student preferences for teacher education have fallen significantly and are likely to continue to fall. (Less than 5 percent of last Fall's freshman class indicated a preference for teacher education, down almost 20 percent from a decade earlier.)

A number of black teacher educators have already noted the potential impact of this phenomenon on staffing patterns for urban schools, suggesting that the very existence of the black public school teacher is threatened—not for malicious reasons, but because capable young blacks are opting out of teacher education. Compounding the shortage of the applicant pool is the likelihood that in an era of a total job surplus, attrition among practicing teachers is likely to grow from the current level of 6 to 8 percent to a much higher percentage.

Given the decline of fiscal and other public support for schools, and the rapidly accelerating need for teachers and other educational personnel, we need to give serious reconsideration to ways of attracting more and more capable persons into the profession. Mr. Chairman, we believe this merits the deep interest of this Congress and particularly of this Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recognize that this Committee does not have a specific legislative agenda on this issue. In a time of fiscal austerity, professional development and educational research never do well, and the re-emergence of Federalism and enactment of consolidation measures will compound the difficulties that confront schools of education. Budget reductions will further exacerbate this problem. The efforts of this Congress to initiate new programs will necessarily be minimal. Nevertheless, because of the critical nature of the problems outlined above—particularly, relative to the "talent pool" of prospective teachers—we believe that this committee should exert leadership on the concerns discussed here. Consequently, we urge the members of this committee to:

A. Stimulate the expansion and enhancement of the "talent pool" of perspective teachers through a significant new merit-based fellowship/scholarship program to attract the most capable of students into teacher education.

B. Expand rather than eliminate the "forgiveness provisions" contained in the federal student loan programs for students in teacher education.

C. Assure that your colleagues on the Appropriations Committee assign priority to and commit resources to building capacity within schools, colleges and departments of education to meet the crises of shortage and quality (funding of the Weiss provisions (sec. 533) of the Education Amendments of 1980 (Public Law 96-374), would facilitate this recommendation).

D. Provide federal incentives and support for research, development, and dissemination in the area of teaching and learning, and for capacity building in fields identified as high national priorities through increased support for the National Institute of Education.

E. Stimulate both LEAs and SEAs to give serious attention to the need to build continuous professional development programs for teaching personnel (using successful Teacher Corps/Teacher Centers modules as they implement the block grant authorization.

F. Maintain policies consistent with those enunciated in the Department of Education Organization Act, having to do with Federal nonintervention in national accreditation matters and the strengthening of the National Advisory Committee on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility to avoid proliferation of accreditation bodies or their intrusion into the affairs of institutions of higher education.

G. Encourage strengthened provisions in the National Center for Education Statictics authorization that call for NCES to undertake appropriate supply-demand surveys of educational personnel and other relevant studies; and finally, Mr. Chairman,

H. Develop new legislative incentives for foreign language development, educational technology, women's equity, etc., that will ultimately impact on schools, and that the concept of "front end" monies for schools of education become an integral part of such legislation. We firmly believe that if SCDE's are given the opportunity to "gear up" by retraining their faculty, redoing their curriculum, undertaking necessary research and devising new delivery systems, then the interests of the Congress can be better served in the implementation of these new thrusts.

We thank you for this opportunity.

[Excerpt from the Journal of Teacher Education, March-April 1981]

CREATING THE CONDITIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE: EDUCATION'S UNFINISHED AGENDA

(By Dean C. Corrigan, Texas A&M University)

The tragedy is that most people do not recognize the life and death nature of teaching. . . . Every moment in the lives of teachers and pupils brings critical decisions of motivation, reinforcement, reward ego enhancement, and goal direction. Proper professional decisions enhance learning and life; improper decisions send the learner towards incremental death in openness to experience and inability to learn and contribute. Doctors and lawyers probably have neither more nor less to do with life, death, and freedom than do teachers. Therefore, the teaching profession must continue its negotiations with society in behalf of more perfect education for its children. Teaching is definitely a matter of life and death. It should be entrusted only to the most thoroughly prepared professionals. (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, Nash, 1976, p. 15)

It now is abundantly clear that the educational system will not improve merely as a result of changes in programs of teacher education at colleges and universities. If we prepare teachers with the latest knowledge and skill and then place them in work situations where they cannot use this knowledge and skill, we will merely produce more candidates for the teacher drop-out list. Unless we make the conditions for professional practice a reality in the public schools, teaching will not become a profession. Reforming teacher education will not be enough.

The principal problem in schools today is teacher burn out. Teachers are leaving at such a rapid rate, and the number of students entering teacher education programs has declined so rapidly, that another severe teacher shortage is imminent. Teachers are dropping out not only because they cannot survive on their salaries, which in some states are near the poverty level, but because the conditions they need to practice their profession do not exist. (In 1969, 36 percent of the undergraduates in higher education institutions were interested in teaching as a career; in 1979 only 10 percent indicate a preference for teaching.)

Teachers are being driven from the profession because they are confronted with two equally unacceptable choices: to attempt to serve their clients without adequate salaries, training, and conditions for professional practice and be doomed to failure and blame, or to refuse to serve their clients until these essentials are provided and thus appear to have deserted their clients and profession. Teachers feel that they are on a spiral toward futility.

The critical point is that the conditions for professional practice do not exist widely, either financially or psychologically, for the teacher today.

As Howey pointed out in his review of *Educating a Profession*, the AACTE Bicentennial Commission Report:

"The overriding goal of quality individualization, let alone personalization, of instruction is not a reality in most schools. If the current dominant operational models of schooling continue, then in some ways teachers are "overtrained" already. More intensive and sophisticated initial preparation combined with more formalized transitional internships could very conceivably exacerbate already existing role conflicts, unless expectations for and conditions surrounding teachers are changed as well." (Howey, 1976, pp. 81–84)

The same message is true for the larger profession of teaching. We will not improve the professional status of teaching merely by expanding the knowledge and skill base of teachers. These are essential but not sufficient factors in achieving professionalism.

After a comprehensive review of the characteristics of professions in America. *Educating a Profession* said:

"The question of status within the hierarchy of professions is a false or non-issue. Status is a consequence of important conditions rather than an important condition in its own right. What the teaching profession needs is a set of conditions which are favorable to the delivery of professional level educational service to the society and its communities." (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, & Nash, 1976, p.39)

If the content of teacher education cannot be *used* in the work place of the teacher then colleges of education will continue to be viewed as out of touch and obsolete. It is crucial to the clients we serve as well as to our professional status in this society that new directions in teacher education be embedded in and consonant with equally innovative directions in school renewal. Major reform in one cannot occur without concurrent major reform in the other.

The following comments about the situation in schools and colleges today are intended to provide an unfinished agenda for education in the 1980s.

SCHOOLS TODAY

We must re-school, not de-school, society. Here is a list of some things we must do to make the conditions for professional practice a reality.

1. We must eliminate the labeling and classification of children, the social stigma that this labeling produces, and the notion that schools ought to function as screening stations for other institutions.

We must develop schools based on the principle of *no rejects*—schools based on the firm assumption that every human being has a right to an education and the right to be treated as a person: as a subject, not an object or a symbol on a chart or a category in a student grouping structure.

Continuous progress reporting systems with diagnostic profiles describing each student's human variability, exceptionality, and intellectual growth must replace the rating system and the illegitimate comparisons it makes and the failure it produces.

2. We must eliminate the misuse of normative testing and the misinterpretation and misuse of intelligence, achievement and aptitude tests, including state-mandated standardized competency tests, which legislatures are now requiring in almost every state. Tests are being misused to create a system which irresponsibly compares, labels, and classifies not only individuals but schools. Furthermore, as the *Commission on Humanities* recently pointed out, the narrow range of skills and knowledge measured by competency testing should not be equated with the goals of education (Lyman, 1981).

3. We must eliminate overcrowding and the resulting easy anonymity and shallow teacher-pupil contacts, and the objectivity model fostered by a mechanical approach to accountability, which prevent meaningful relationships from developing among administrators, teachers, students and parents.

In too many schools today, punishment and the threat of a failure rather than self-reliance and community decision-making are still emphasized. Motivation is still extrinsic. Schooling is still largely a mass process rather than an individualized one.

Too many schools are run like other custodial institutions. Because they have overwhelming numbers and limited resources for individualized attention, these institutions organize and control life to defend themselves by rigid regulation and routines. Close surveillance is maintained to minimize incidents and insure compliance. Since 5 to 10 percent might misbehave, everybody has to carry the hall pass, except when moving in mass at the sound of the bell. In such schools mindless bureaucracy, conformity and trivia hold sway, and initiative, creativity and independence are thwarted.

When many of America's schools—especially those in urban areas which serve the largest number of students—have armed guards at the doorways and stairwells, after-school detention rooms, and require teachers to police study halls and check hall passes, it is not easy to deny the problem.

Under such conditions, where conformity and mediocrity become the norm, personal incentive, the cornerstone of American democracy is destroyed. The only way to learn to be responsible is to have the opportunity to take responsibility, to make choices and deal with the consequences. It takes a special kind of environment to learn how to be free, and to learn to value freedom, with its obligations to insure the human rights of others as well as our own rights. We learn those behaviors by having a chance to *do* them, not by being *told* about them.

We must develop the kind of personalized relationships between teachers and students in which students are free to say right out loud what they do not know as well as what they do know. Such relationships are based on the realization that academic freedom for teachers and students is reciprocal; one cannot exist in an educational community without the other.

4. We must eliminate the cruel, unreasonable, professionally demeaning practice of corporal punishment and the hypocrisy of seeking professional status while being the only group which permits its members to beat their clients. The two notions are antithetical. Although flogging was outlawed in the Navy in 1913 and is prohibited in the prisons, it is still permitted in schools. All but four states permit corporal punishment, which is legally defined as "the administration of physical pain as punishment." Data show it is used primarily on small children from poor families, in the early grades; these same children are beaten over and over again, which is just one of the indications that it does not work.

Last year was the International Year of the Child; in that context it was interesting to note that the country which preaches human rights all over the world is one of the few countries in which the beating of children is legally sanctioned. In Europe, only West Germany and Great Britain still permit it, and it seems to be on its way out there.

In the future we must exemplify the humanity we explicate: that might is not right, that students do not have to give up their civil rights when they walk into a schoolhouse, that children learn what they live and will not learn such values as love, compassion, and justice if the schools make a sham of them. I know of no college of education which offers a course on how to beat children—it is an *unprofessional* act. Teaching will become a profession only when it stops using outmoded regulations to accommodate the inadequacies of some of its members, and starts using professional *ethics* and knowledge and skill in teaching and learning to guide and judge professional performance.

5. We must eliminate curricular tracking and the caste system it fosters, and the grade-level lock-step which ignores what we know about the ways in which unique selves develop. None of us, as adults, would continue to play a game we had no chance of winning, yet we expect some children to do this every day in school. Because of the relationship between poverty and access to equal educational opportunity, usually it is the children from poor families who find themselves at the

bottom of the heap. Outdated organizational structures and school policies continue to lock the poor into their poverty. Later on we undoubtedly will blame the poor for the state that we and they are in.

We must organize the educational setting so that all students know what they can do to experience success. The methods used to differentiate instruction should be neither exclusively behavioristic nor cognitive, child centered nor discipline centered; they should be posefully eclectic.

6. We must eliminate the inflexible and non-variable time schedule and the conformity it demands. Instruction may be less formal in schools today, but it still follows the lesson presentation-assignment-testing mode. The basic configuration of class sizes of 25 to 40, which is a fourth century invention, has not changed, even with all the knowledge about individual differences and research on achievement gains that can be made with differentiated instruction.

A recent paper by Goldberg provides documentation of the origin of current class sizes.

The profound insights of the 12th century philosopher, physician and theologian, Moses Maimonides, including many education matters, are detailed in the Mishnen Tora, a 14 volume codification of law and tradition which he started to compose at age 16. The standard translation into English of the Code of Maimonides is published by Yale University Press. The passage on class size from Maimonides reads as follows: When a community has 25 children they are to study under one teacher. If the number in the class is 26, but not more than 40, an assistant should be placed with him to help with the instruction. If there are more than 40, a second teacher should be appointed. This commentary on class size did not originate with Maimonides. It is attributable to regulation 21a of the Talmudic Tractate, Babe Bathra, written in the 4th century, 800 years before Maimonides. The classic translation of the work published by the Soncino Press of London reads: The number of pupils to be assigned to each teacher is twenty-five. If they are forty, we appoint an assistant, at the expense of the town. (Goldberg, 1977, p. 15)

After all these years the basic configuration of the classroom must change. Recent research (Glass & Smith, 1979) shows once again what good teachers have always known. Class size makes a difference in student achievement because teachers have the time and space to differentiate instruction and utilize personalized approaches. In the future if the public will not provide the resources for smaller classes for a full day, schools may be better off to have children go to school for a half-day with 10–15 in a class than a full day with 25–35 in a class, unless an aide can be provided for the larger class. It will be fruitless to add more specialists to collect diagnostic data on children unless teacher-pupil ratios are provided which permit teachers to use these data in developing differentiated approaches for each child. Schools must recognize and utilize the individual's own rhythm, learning speed, and style of learning.

7. We must eliminate the failure to take responsibility for progress achieved by all students, the "push-outs" as well as the merit scholars, while they are under our guidance.

No matter how bad home conditions are, students ought to know and feel more at 3:00 p.m. than they knew and felt at 8 a.m.; they should know and feel more in June than they did in September, and certainly more in 1981 than in 1971. We must stop blaming the victims.

8. We must eliminate the stereotyped view of teachers as people who perform the same role 40 years after they start their careers as they did on the first day on the job.

Differentiation of roles both in schools and in a variety of human service settings should characterize teaching, and support systems should be established in which teachers share their specific knowledge and skills with other human service professionals. Only when the teaching profession recognizes the variety of settings in which teaching is a vital function, and includes teachers from these non-school settings as part of the teaching force will the profession reach its full maturity.

9. We must eliminate racial, religious, social-class, generational isolation; the isolation of the handicapped and the prejudice and discrimination that isolation breeds; the defeatist or snobbish self-concepts it nurtures; and the mockery that this isolation makes of the fundamental right of access to equal education opportunity.

We must reaffirm our belief that all human beings have a right to become all they are capable of becoming.

10. We must eliminate provincialism and the lack of opportunity to speculate about the unknown world ahead.

Our schools must foster global awareness with the view that all children of the present population will live in a mobile, international community, solving problems with ideas and technology we cannot imagine, in a world as different from today's as today's is from that of the first settlers of this country.

11. We must eliminate the paucity of curriculum options and the boredom it creates.

The school must be integrated into the community and be an integrator of the community. We must teach students to cope with the real world. America's schools have been caught in the dilemma of their posture toward reform and preservation. Local school boards and state agencies, in their attempt to keep all pressure groups happy, have encouraged or demanded that schools be conservative and preservative. Teacher organizations rarely have chosen to challenge parents in favor of a more suitable school situation for children. When challenges have come from teachers' associations they have focused on teachers' rights rather than students' rights.

As a result, schools have remained a place for "safe ideas." Adopted curricula backed by publicly screened textbooks and materials have kept bounds on social thought. Within the schoolhouse doors, controversial issues are deliberately avoided. Even though children are confronted everyday in the media and in their personal lives with the problems of discrimination, drugs, sex, poverty, war, pollution, energy, injustice, and corruption, the schools have not dealt with these realities in ways that help young people to make intelligent decisions about them. The more significant a question, the more likely it is to be controversial. Therefore, students learn the answers to the really important questions from their friends in their peer group, the media, or their parents, or on their own.

This system survived in simpler, days, but it no longer serves the needs of society and its children. Education has reached the end of an era. America now requires a new breed of teacher-scholar for a new kind of purpose-oriented education system—a well prepared, highly motivated professional, capable of understanding a broad range of learning needs and of designing and implementing curricular and instructional strategies to help this generation of Americans meet the challenges of society in 1981 and beyond.

The new professionals must teach the basics, but they must go beyond the basics in order to prepare students for today's world. It makes little sense for today's teacher to speak of responsibility to their clients solely because they are teaching them to read, write, and compute, if they are also producing what C. Wright Mills has called happy robots. Critical thinking skill must be considered as basic as literacy itself.

To teach a human being to read, write, spell and do math and science with technical proficiency only, while neglecting to point out the purposes for which these skills are to be used, is to produce a menace to society. Reading is a lethal weapon in the hands of a person who uses it to build a better bomb to blow up his neighbor's house because his neighbor happens to have a different shade of skin color.

The most severe shortcoming of our education programs at all levels is that we have concentrated on *means* rather than *ends*. We have been so enamored with organizational and technological changes that we have failed to examine the fundamental purposes of education. Too often, we have acted as if education is a valueless activity with no relationship to the great problems of our time. Too often, we have maintained the illusion of neutrality. Those who hope that education can be completely objective confuse some very important matters. There is no such thing as a value-free education. There is only the choice to be conscious and positive about our values, or to conceal and confuse them. Teacher educators and public school professionals for 1981 and beyond had better have conscious, positive values. There never was a time when values were so much in demand.

If the new teaching professional is to emerge in the next decade, the conditions for professional practice must be extended to teacher education institutions as well as to schools. Reform must move in both directions.

TEACHER EDUCATION TODAY

At present, little attention is being paid to the education and re-education of teachers. Most of the dialogue deals with surface issues. For example, many states are mandating teacher competency tests for beginners as if that will solve all the problems of quality. The greatest danger is that the public will become prisoners of the idea that testing teachers has solved the problems of teacher education. (We educators have to take some responsibility for the current over-reliance on competency tests as an answer to everything. We should have realized that it was just a short jump from labeling students with tests to labeling teachers with tests.) The problems of teacher education are not insoluble, but they are not problems that simple solutions or minor tinkering will correct. More fundamental changes are needed.

My analysis shows that teacher education today attempts to do too much with too little, and it is funded at the lowest level of any professional education program in the United States.

The paradox is not that we cannot prepare teachers but that we do not prepare them. The public has been unwilling to provide the time and money necessary for true professional teacher preparation. Eight years are required to educate a veterinarian, but only four years are provided to prepare a teacher for the most complex and demanding responsibilities imaginable—developing the intellectual potential of our children. (At times it seems that our society is more concerned about its cattle than its kids.) We must turn this situation around.

To recall the statement that concluded the AACTE Bicentennial Commission Report, "What the teaching profession needs is a totally new set of concepts regarding the nature of today's society, its educational demands and the kind of professional education necessary to produce teacher-scholars who have the courage and competence to reform public education in America." (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, & Nash, 1976, p. 138)

Educating a Profession provided an extensive list of reforms needed in teacher education in the 1980s. We need to take another look at these reforms today to see how far we have come in the past few years.

The report stated that only those preparation programs capable of providing the necessary "life space" for preparing professional personnel should survive. (The term "life space" is used to refer to the resources too often in short supply in many teacher education programs—time, facilities, personnel, instructional and research materials, access to quality instruction in other academic units, etc.) Programs which lack sufficient "life space" and thus compromise quality standards should secure the resources or combine with other institutions in quality collaborative efforts to get resources. Teaching will not become a profession unless we commit ourselves to the development of comprehensive programs of professional education with the quality of "life space" at least equivalent to the other professions which produce graduates who deal with matters of life and death in their work place. Also, we must develop more stringent quality control measures.

Evaluation of potential and performance should occur at the following points: (1) admission to the university, (2) matriculation into the teacher education program, (3) prior to student teaching, and (4) after a period of demonstrated competence before entry to the profession. Licensing should be awarded only after this period of demonstrated competence during a year's internship under the supervision of a mentor or a local review board of professional peers in a cooperating teacher center. This internship should be an integral part of all preservice teacher education programs.

The professional education program should include (1) the comprehensive study of pedagogy, including direct experiences in teaching and learning which relate theory to practice, (2) a concentration in one or more teaching fields, (3) a solid foundation in the liberal arts and sciences, including basic skills, and (4) an interdisciplinary view of the undergirding disciplines of education. These include such areas as psychology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, political science and economics—with an emphasis on "theory in use," not merely memorization.

Furthermore, new teachers should have the skills, understandings and desire to improve education. This means prospective teachers must be educated to be tough-minded on occasion, capable of dealing with the unexpected, and skilled in the politics of school and community change processes. They must be professionally literate child advocates.

Examinations should be included as one aspect of all approved teacher education programs. All tests should be administered by the college responsible for the program and the test items should be related to the goals and objectives of the program. Graduates of teacher education should meet individual progress goals as well as institutional standards. The adequacy of the evaluation procedures and instruments should be reviewed as part of the state education department program approval, and National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, procedures. Tests should not be laid on as single definitions of teacher competence by any state or national agency or legislature.

To develop the public trust that the profession can be accountable and responsible for its own testing and other forms of quality control, new teeth must be put into national accreditation and state program approval standards. Futhermore, the misuse of emergency and transcript-only certificates must be stopped. Unless the loopholes which by-pass professional program evaluation are plugged, efforts at quality control by teacher education institutions and the teaching profession will continue to be undermined. State boards of education and school superintendents must begin to be held accountable for holding to "entry to profession" criteria along with teachers and teacher educators.

In addition to these tougher quality controls and more demanding programs, increases in teacher salaries must occur if more top college students are to be attracted to teacher education. Indeed, competitive salaries are a prerequisite to bringing about all of the other conditions for quality that I have mentioned.

INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

We must extend the improvement of teacher education to inservice as well as preservice education. The strategy for improving the schools through teacher education in the past was to prepare new teachers with the most recent knowledge in their field and new techniques for individualizing instruction, and send them out as crusaders to improve the schools. This strategy has failed—the new teachers and their ideas have been swallowed up by the system. The teachers now in the schools who are 40–45 years old have 20–25 years of teaching left. They are the career teachers. Unless we reeducate them right along with the new teachers, the schools will not improve significantly. The major challenge facing this country in the next five years is to reeducate two million experienced teachers. This cannot be done between 8:00 and 8:30 in the morning or between 4:00 and 5:00 in the afternoon.

Even though the knowledge base needed by educators has developed rapidly during the last decade, there is at present no significant effort to disseminate this knowledge meaningfully to the two million teachers in the schools and the thousands of educators who teach, administer and counsel in education programs in community agencies beyond schools. Other professions, (e.g., medicine, law, industry, etc.) recognize the need, especially in times of rapid change, to provide for the reeducation of their practitioners. Eastman Kodak, for instance, reinvests at least 10 percent of its gross profits in research and training to improve the knowledge and skill of its employees. IBM requires nearly eighty days a year for professional development activities related to the work of service personnel. The military invests a great deal in the improvement of the performance and capabilities of its personnel. Public Health, Internal Revenue Service, and Cooperative Extension Services of Agriculture are continually engaged in learning activities designed to increase knowledge and skill related to the work setting.

In a world rocked with the explosion of knowledge, the public and the teaching profession must begin to realize that the continually learning teacher is as important as the continually learning child. Inservice education must be provided for all teachers throughout their careers.

CONCLUSION

Our colleges and departments of education form the preparation and research arm of the education system, and that system will only be as strong as that arm. In view of the current crises in the schools, that development arm must work with teachers, administrators, school boards, and legislators to discover new ways to create the conditions for professional *practice* as well as professional study.

As former President Lyman (Stein, 1980) of Stanford University, now head of the Rockefeller Foundation, recently reminded his colleagues at Stanford, "Our work with the schools will not be effective unless, to use a phrase beloved by the Quakers, it 'speaks to the condition' of the schools. To the actual condition, that is, and not to some idealized form that may exist in the minds of sheltered university faculty members, but is unattainable in the real world . . . . One reason why the dividing line between schools and universities in this country so often seems more like a Grand Canyon than a grade crossing is because school teachers and university scholars have so little sense of being involved in a common enterprise" (Stein, 1980). In the 1980s, the aim of teacher education must be to change the *setting* for teaching and learning as well as to improve the teacher.

Central to the new design of teacher education is recognition of the fact that preservice education, inservice education, and the schools and colleges themselves, are interrelated and interacting components of one education system. We must replace our present disconnected approach with a new partnership that provides an interlocking process of educational improvement and teacher education at all levels of the educational spectrum. Resources, both financial and personal, must be directed toward strategies that link schools seeking to change with teacher-education institutions seeking to break out of obsolete patterns of preparation. Furthermore, we must pay the kind of salaries and create the kind of conditions for professional practice that will attract and keep outstanding people in teaching.

Perhaps at no other time in the history of this country have the American people faced such a crucial choice concerning the improvement of schools and colleges. Either they reaffirm their faith in education through increased financial and psychological support or they will witness the demise of public education. We cannot let this happen by default. We must not turn and run before every gust of public discontent. The time to make our stand is now.

We can reverse the spiral toward futility. That is if all of the partners in this profession, in schools, in colleges and in state and national agencies develop the good sense to stop fighting amongst ourselves. In this coming year under the theme of "Creating the Conditions for Professional Practice," AACTE must become a unifying force for the education profession. Let's refocus the energy we have wasted on internal bickering and bring the full power of the profession to bear on the problems involved in improving the schools and teacher education. And let us also recognize that if we are to be successful in this endeavor we will need another partner—the public.

Up to now, the public has pointed its finger at educators and held them accountable alone for the conditions in the schools. That kind of behavior has not produced results. We must find new ways to bring parents into the educational situation so that they can be shown what can be accomplished with better salaries, curriculum, administration, teaching techniques, school facilities, and quality teacher education.

Parents must be convinced that academic excellence and quality teaching in our education system are still our country's greatest hope, and that the education of other peoples' children is as important as the education of their own. All our citizens must renew a commitment to the fundamental American premise (starting with the general education law of 1647), that education is a societal good as well as a personal good.

The strength of the whole country is improved when all of the children of all of the people receive a quality education, not just the children of the rich and powerful. In today's world, the future of any nation that does not consider education a national as well as local priority is bleak indeed. Our greatest and most immediate challenge is to convince our country's new leaders that education is as much a matter of national security as defense.

I firmly believe that we—educators in schools and college—*can* restore the public's confidence in their schools by accomplishing three goals. We must show the public (1) that schools can be simultaneously child-centered and knowledge-centered; (2) that schools can stress critical thinking, the arts, and aesthetic appreciation without weakening the three Rs; and (3) that schools can be humane and educate well.

Being a realist in a time of great adversity, I realize that the conditions for professional practice that I envision will not be realized overnight, but I have faith that they can be achieved in our professional lifetime if we work together.

I enlist your time, your energy, and your talent to the task of completing education's unfinished agenda.

A SURVEY OF TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

(By Cleborne D. Maddux, Ph. D., Center for Applied Behavioral Research; David Henderson, Ed. D., Associate Professor; and Charles Darby, Ed. D. Associate Professor, College of Education, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Tex.)

No research study is needed in order to show that teacher salaries in general, and Texas teaching salaries in particular, are not keeping pace with the burgeoning cost of living. While teaching has historically been a low-paying activity it has been evident for some time that the past ten years of inflation coupled with cuts in school spending have further depressed the real income of teachers, with the actual buying power of teachers in the U.S. at large declining by an average 17 percent since 1970. Texas teachers have not escaped this phenomenon as evidenced by the fact that Texas currently ranks 35th among the states in average teaching salary.

While these facts can be verified by simple arithmetic, the human reactions to them are not as easily assessed. Last spring, the authors agreed that there appeared to be a trend of deteriorating morale among public school teachers enrolling in graduate level courses at Sam Houston State University. At the same time, the researchers noticed that increasing numbers of these practicing teachers seemed to be experiencing financial crises. Many reported accepting "moonlighting" positions in addition to their teaching duties. The researchers wondered just how severe and how pervasive this trend was, and the present study was the result. TSTA officials were also interested, and they agreed to supply a computer-generated random sample of the 110,000 TSTA members so that a questionnaire could be mailed to them. The researchers designed the questionnaire which was intended to explore various elements of job satisfaction, future professional plans, moonlighting behavior, and other variables affecting the lives and work of public school teachers in Texas. The questionnaire was piloted on three graduate education classes and on a random sample of 100 teachers in a Houston-area school district. The questionnaire was revised several times based on these trial runs. Figure 1 presents the instrument in its final form.

The questionnaire was mailed to 424 randomly selected TSTA members in May of 1980. This mailing, plus a followup mailing to nonresponding subjects, produced a final return of 291 questionnaires (70 percent).

Even though the researchers expected to find evidence of deteriorating morale, they were amazed at the results of their survey. The completed questionnaire painted a picture of Texas teachers who face daily economic hardship and acute discouragement. The results of this study, coupled with knowledge of economic, political, and other cultural trends affecting education in Texas clearly point to the strong likelihood of a new and painful teacher shortage in Texas in the near future.

Figure 1

TEACHERS AND MOONLIGHTING

DIRECTIONS: Please circle or answer all items that apply to you. Add comments if you find a question to be vague.

1. What is your age? . . . . Years ________________

2. Sex. . . . . Male Female

3. Marital Status . . . . Married Single Other

4. If married, does your spouse work? . . . . Yes No Does Not Apply

5. What is your highest degree? . . . . Bachelor's Master's Doctorate

6. Including yourself, how many people do you have living in your household; plus any others for whom you provide at least 50% of their support?. . . . . Dependents ________________

7. Are you the major bread winner in your household? . . . . Yes No Equal

8. Are you seriously considering leaving the teaching profession? . . . . Yes No
   If yes, why are you considering leaving? ________________

9. In what type of district do you teach? . . . . . Urban Suburban Rural

10. What grade level do you primarily teach? K-5 6-8 9-12

11. How many years have you taught in the public schools?. . . . . Years ________________

12. What is your primary teaching subject or duty? . . . . ________________

13. What is your current teaching salary per year? . $ ________________

14. Do you have an extra job during the summer when you are not under contract to your district?. . . . . Yes No

15. How much do you earn during the summer?. . . . . $ ________________

16. Do you have an extra job during the regular school year to supplement your teaching salary? (Include school-related and nonschool-related jobs. For example: school bus driver, salesperson, bookkeeper, etc.) . . . Yes No

****

If your answer to Question 16 is yes, please answer the following questions.

****

17. Do you feel that the quality of your teaching would improve if you did not have a second job during the regular school year?. . . . . . . Yes No

18. How much extra money do you earn during the regular school year from the moonlighting job? . $ ________________

19. How many hours per week during the regular school year do you spend working at the extra job? . . . . Hours ________________

20. Would you quit working the second job if your salary was increased adequately? . . . . Yes No

21. How large a raise in your teaching salary would you have to get to enable you to give up moonlighting during the regular school year? . . . . $ ________________

22. What is your extra job during the regular school year? (Please give a job title such as bookkeeper, rancher, clerk, waitress, etc., not the name of your employer.). . . . . ________________ ________________

Some of the most revealing answers came to question number 8, which asked if the respondent was seriously considering leaving teaching as a profession. The researchers were shocked and dismayed to discover that considerably more than one in every three teachers, or 38.4 percent of those responding indicated that they were seriously considering leaving teaching as a profession! When asked why, 46 percent listed low pay. The average salary of the sample was $14,112.89, with only 21 percent earning more than the national teaching average of $16,000. The average number of years experience of teachers in the study was 11.7, with 64 percent holding the bachelor's degree and 36 percent with the master's degree. Perhaps this degree of dissatisfaction with an average salary of approximately $14,000 is more understandable when viewed in light of the "intermediate standard budget", a figure set annually by the U.S. Department of Labor as the amount of income required for a family of four to live in a solidly middle-class, but not affluent fashion. That figure has not been set for Fall 1980, but was $20,856 as of Fall, 1979. This means that the average teacher in the study falls short of the 1979 mark by $6,743.11! This must be particularly serious for the 30 percent of respondents in Texas who do not have a working spouse.

This is probably the appropriate point to look at some characteristics of the sample. The 291 respondents represent all 20 geographic TSTA Districts. Their mean age is 38.6 with a range from 22 to 67 years of age. Nineteen point nine percent are male while 80.1 percent are female. With regard to marital status, 76.7 percent are married, 17.2 percent are single, and 23.7 percent checked the "other" response. Seventy point one percent indicated that they have working spouses while 29.9 percent do not. About half (50.2 percent) live in one- or two-member households, 40.9 percent live in three- or four-member households, and 8.9 percent live in five- or six-member households. A total of 39.9 percent reported that they are the major bread winner in their household. Most respondents, 40.5 percent teach in urban districts, 32.6 percent in suburban, and 26.8 percent in rural districts. Elementary teachers (50.9 percent) outnumber those in grades six through eight (19.9 percent) and in high schools (29.2 percent).

There are a number of interesting points in the above descriptive data. While more than 80 percent of the sample are females, 39.9 percent of all teachers surveyed say they are the major breadwinner in their families, and another 21.3 percent of the total say they provide one-half of their family's income. Only 38.8 of those surveyed contribute less than half of the family income. These figures clearly indicated the importance of the teaching income to the well-being of the families involved. A further breakdown by sex is also interesting. The survey reveals that 72.4 percent of all males and 31.8 percent of all females are the major breadwinners in their households. Since the average teaching salary was $14,122, it is equally clear that there must be a considerable amount of financial hardship present particularly in those families where the teaching salary is the sole, or the major source of support.

This does not bode well for the male teacher, since our survey revealed that nearly three out of four male teachers provide the major support for their households. We have found more discontent among males, and we might expect to find few males engaged in teaching in Texas. The data confirms this expectation. Only eight, or 5.4 percent of elementary teachers are males while 16 (16.8 percent) and 34 (43.6 percent) junior high and high school teachers respectively are male. Texas has an especially acute shortage of males at the elementary level (5.4 percent). The national average for male elementary teachers is around 18 percent. This is particularly infortunate in view of the high percentage of children who now live or will live in homes without a male adult (one half or more by some estimates) and in view of the general agreement as to the importance of a male model for young boys to emulate. The low percentage of male teachers in Texas is probably due to the fact that males have access to more desirable jobs than do females. The trend for few males to enter and many to leave teaching is unlikely to be soon reversed, since the survey reveals that considerably more males than females are dissatisfied and considering quitting their jobs. Nearly half of the male teachers (48.3 percent) and 33.5 percent of female teachers say they are seriously considering leaving the profession.

The questionnaire also elicited reasons from those who indicated they were considering giving up teaching. Many reasons were cited, but the most frequent reason, given by 46 percent, was too little money. Some rather caustic comments were received. "Try raising two kids on $12,000 a year", one teacher wrote, "and you won't have to ask."

Such dissatisfaction with salary is all the more remarkable in light of numerous studies which have shown that in the past, teachers have not been money-oriented. Other reasons listed were problems with the administration such as lack of appreciation, excessive paper work, lack of input into school policy decisions, and problems concerning students such as discipline and lack of motivation.

In view of the above findings, it is not surprising that the survey revealed that holding a job during the school year (moonlighting) as well as working during the summer is common among the respondents. Twenty-two percent of the sample indicated that they moonlight, while 30.2 percent hold extra jobs during the summer (16.8 percent do both). Not surprisingly, 67.2 percent of the moonlighters indicated that they are the major breadwinners for their families. Half of these are males and fully one half of the moonlighters are considering leaving teaching.

Since summer work and moonlighting seems to be a widespread practice, information relating to amount of income from each is important. Summer jobs provide an average yearly supplement of $1,252. So for those who held them it appears that these jobs are probably very low pay, since this amount spread over the twelve weeks of the summer works out to an average salary of about $100 a week.

The information on summer jobs is interesting but the researchers were more concerned with the moonlighting problem, since an additional job would probably impact most on teaching effectiveness if held during the regular year. Respondents reported an average yearly supplement of $2,799.46 from their moonlighting jobs. This was earned by spending an average 13.6 hours per week at the moonlighting activity. Again, these jobs appear to be very low pay. The survey revealed that teachers moonlight in relatively menial positions. Respondents listed selling tickets for school athletic events, mowing lawns, working in a church nursery, babysitting, waiting tables, and various kinds of sales. All respondents holding moonlighting positions were asked if they felt that the quality of their teaching would improve if they did not moonlight. Sixty-four percent of those moonlighting answered yes to this question. Moonlighting subjects were also asked if they would quit the second job if their teaching salaries were increased adequately, and if so, how much of a raise they would require before halting their moonlighting activities. Seventy-five percent of moonlighters indicated that they would quit if given an adequate raise, while the average amount of necessary salary increase named was $3,400 per year.

DISCUSSION

One can only conclude that a state of crisis in education exists in Texas. One out of three teachers are seriously considering leaving teaching. Twenty-two percent feel compelled to moonlight at jobs far below their level of education and experience. Males are scarce and are being driven to consider giving up their profession in even larger numbers than are females. The prime source of dissatisfaction is inadequate salaries, but poor administrative policies and lack of discipline are also major sources of discontent.

If present trends such as double-digit inflation and decreased financial support for education are not reversed, a severe teacher shortage in the near future seems unavoidable. Indeed, such shortages already exist in some geographic areas and in certain teaching specialties. Males will continue to decline to teach or to leave the field once they have entered. Better students will refuse to become teachers, and better teachers will leave the profession. Moonlighting will become even more common, taking its toll on family life and on time spent preparing for the next day's teaching. One west Texas school district has adopted a policy against moonlighting and the courts have upheld that policy. If other school districts react in this fashion, this will only increase the speed with which teachers leave the profession.

There is a need to repeat this study over the next few years to see if the trends discovered in this research continue. The researchers plan to make their survey a yearly one. If the education environment is not drastically improved in the near future, a substantial decline in the quality of public school education in Texas is inevitable. Time will tell.

Mr. **Simon**. Dr. Robinson in her statement, among other things, made one suggestion, and that is that every State government create a commission of teachers and others to take a look at what is happening in their area. I am not suggesting that as the answer but as one—I think Dean Lanier said—one thing that will provide the answer. Does something like that make sense?

Ms. **Lanier**. I think that might help and make a contribution. But the talk and discussion of the problem has gone on and on without some action accompanying it. Unless there is something implied that can be done, I think that may add to the general discouragement of things. If we just talk more about the problems really "well known." These are historical problems and they are exacerbated with the shift and changes that occurred in the seventies.

Mr. **Simon**. Are they well known in the education community? I do not know that the public at large understands the dimensions of the problem. I am not sure I understand.

Ms. **Lanier**. If we even talk about the public awareness of the problems in teaching, there has been a lot communicated to the public. There are a lot of problems here.

Mr. **Corrigan**. I think the numbers of people engaged in discussion of this problem needs to be expanded beyond just the teachers' association and the colleges of education. I agree with Sharon's recommendation. For instance, I think if you have additional hearings on this topic it will be very important to include the State school board administrations and the school board administrators in this country. It is the local school boards and State boards which issue the certificates. They set up a system where peers come in to do an evaluation of the program. At the same time the same State board will pass a resolution which allows an agency on the recommendation of a supervisor to hire somebody who is 18 years old and 90 hours of college preparation. They can get an emergency certificate, and this has been the response to this problem in many cases. The response is to issue emergency certificates and the data on this, two things are happening, they are giving emergency certificates and dropping courses.

You have a situation unless we can convince the State boards of education and State superintendents that they have a responsibility in the role of improving teacher education, we will not solve the problem. They are the gatekeepers.

Mr. **Simon**. We are talking about a situation—it is a chicken-and-egg situation, where society at large has to make improvements, but things have to happen all the way around.

What would happen to any of your schools—what if you were to say to get into teacher education in your school, you have to be in the top one-fourth of your high school class or something like that?

In other words, just as law school or medical school requirements exist—and I am not advocating this, I am just probing at this point.

Ms. **Baker**. I think in addition to the kind of student that we have at teacher training institutions, we also have to look at the quality of the teacher trainer, and so often we tend to blame most of our problems on the kind of teachers coming in to teacher training. We cannot overlook the lack of staff development that has taken place in teacher training institutions. Many of the professors who are training teachers and who are working with teachers in preservice and inservice have not had an opportunity to upgrade their skills, to get back into the classroom to know what is needed. We cannot even wait a decade to change, and many teachers have not had any staff development in the last 10, 15 years. So it is not just the kind of student, but that does not answer your question.

Mr. **Simon**. Again, we are getting back to a multifaceted type of thing.

Ms. CHRISTIAN. I would like to add, in teacher education programs, even though we are faced with a declining enrollment in the school, we are still raising the standards for teachers to be formally admitted to teacher education. A student may be admitted to a college, and in some instances 2 and 2.2 may be standard for admittance to the college, but for most teacher training institutions, that has been one of the areas we have worked with in increasing the grade point average before a student can get final approval into teacher education. I have not found this in the past to be detrimental; it gave a kind of respect for teacher education because of the old adage, those who can, do, otherwise, those who cannot, teach. So the students realize they have to make a certain average in order to get into teacher education and to maintain it. It just makes it more difficult when these other influences mitigate so negatively against what it will be like when they are out.

Mr. CORRIGAN. I think we have to do that. In my personal experience at Texas A&M we have not lost enrollments by having additional requirements to get into teacher education. Students have to matriculate into teacher education at the end of the sophomore year; and except for the college of architecture, the college of education is the only college on campus to have the grade point requirement to get in.

We do not just use the test scores, we use their performance in the first 2 years, but I think that is what has helped our program. I believe quality begets quality. We have used the other example. We have said for years that you cannot have 5-year programs because teachers do not earn enough money. That has not improved the numbers.

So, I am hoping we will work towards improving the quality and at least try that approach, and I think it is happening in a number of institutions. It will be a real challenge for teacher education institutions not to lower their requirements just to meet the numbers crunch. That will be a real test of our profession, I believe.

Mr. SIMON. A couple of you mentioned the capitation grant idea. Can you give me a few more specifics as to what you mean by that?

Ms. LANIER. Well, the capitation grants as I have understood them from the campus at Michigan State were created in response to a need. They needed medical doctors. Now we are saying what we need is an increased number, not just of teachers overall, although that is true in some critical areas, like math and science, but we need the talent. The word capitation comes from per capita, or per head.

Mr. SIMON. I understand the concept, but I do not understand how that will help our situation.

Ms. LANIER. It seems one of the necessary criteria for an outstanding program is outstanding students. To retain those students you need institutions which offer a challenge to them.

Mr. SIMON. What you are saying is, you want a capitation grant not just simply on a per capita basis of attendance, but for those who are above a certain level who come into the program.

Ms. LANIER. It is like adding the quality criteria on top of the numbers and/or particular subject matters.

The science field is in very serious trouble as well as math in terms of not enough people there now.

For across the board, I would hope the quality issue, those criteria, would have to be defined, but would be held. They also might be just for particular subject fields that are high right now as well.

Mr. **Simon**. Let me finally toss this question to you. You have really all answered it somewhat, but I want to get some more specific answers here. If suddenly you became chairperson of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and you wanted to do something to enrich the quality or to improve the quality of those who are now moving into teaching, what would you do?

Ms. **Lanier**. I guess I would work for an incentive system if that is possible, and that was why I suggested the capitation grants or something analogous to them.

Those are now gone in the field of medicine because it did solve the problem. It provided an incentive. They are decreasing the program on a graduated basis because it is solving the problem.

Whether in that form or not, it would serve for an incentive system for encouraging talent into the field of teaching which I see is very highly needed at this time.

Ms. **Baker**. My first priority would be to develop a program across the Nation where trainers of teachers would be able to go back and get some training specifically in the kinds of schools and classrooms that we are trying to train teachers for. That would be the first step so there would be the staff development of those trainers of teachers.

The second would be to identify the outstanding teachers, teachers already in the classroom, who need to go on beyond the bachelor degree to get more specific training, graduate training.

There would be some incentives and support there, the kind of things the teacher corps does well.

The third would be to identify the outstanding student who wants to go into teaching and give the student the kind of training, a nontraditional approach to training which would require exposure to staff development from those who would be going back from my No. 1 point.

It would be sort of like a circular effect, three-pronged, but one would definitely have some effect on the other.

Ms. **Christian**. I would use a dual approach, one directed toward increasing the quality of programs in teacher education institutions to encourage the collaborative kinds of efforts with NEA that Sharon articulated to show that demonstrated attempts are being made to look at and improve quality programs, and on the other hand I would do the same thing in terms of trying to do incentive grants to academically talented students while not eliminating our mission to those students who, because of the societal influences, have had economic deprivation which has nothing to do with their intellect.

I would still support those low income students who really need the kind of support, improve our quality program, and then I would look for teachers—and it is related to what Gwen said—and for some kind of incentives to keep good teachers in the classroom.

As soon as teachers are identified and they realize the only upward mobility, the only recognition is to become a principal, supervisor or go to the central office, we pick the best we have in the classroom and put them pushing papers in the central office.

I would like to develop the kind of system that once we get these academically talented students, that we do put them in a classroom and give them incentives in the classroom, collaborate with the college programs so they don't feel a sense of stress and burnout, and that they be rewarded for excellence in teaching.

Ms. QUISENBERRY. I would have two priorities I would set. One relates to what has already been said. An incentive program that gives grants or arranges a loan system to bring outstanding young people into teaching who are dedicated to teaching and will stay.

The other would be to find ways to support colleges of education to implement and to increase the knowledge base within the college faculty, a developmental sort of thing, so that they can keep their programs up to date and adequate for the trainer teachers.

Mr. CORRIGAN. I would not underestimate the importance of speaking out as you are on this important topic and taking it on as a priority. I do not know very many other members of the Congress right now that have education on their agendas as a politically viable cause to be for. They keep talking about the economy and defense. The strength of the Nation really, when you come right down to it, as well as the economy, are tied up in the future of our educational system.

Productivity has to be seen in terms of human capital, not just goods. So I would hope that you would try to develop a network of people who are in political roles, who would say how important teachers are and match the expectations we have with teachers, for teachers, with the kind of support publicly, public support.

A lot of the people used to speak out for education and have withdrawn the commitment. We need to get them back to realizing the importance of education. Unless we do that, unless we have good teachers, we will not have good engineers, good doctors, lawyers, or anything else. It is the next generation, our grandchildren, great-grandchildren, who are going to suffer.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. That is a good note to close on. We thank you very much.

We are pleased to have—and the five of you may be interseted in listening to her testimony—our next witness, Marva Collins, who is perhaps at this point America's most famous teacher.

We are very pleased, to have you here. I have never had the privilege of meeting you before, but we have corresponded. It is a pleasure to have you here.

STATEMENT OF MARVA COLLINS, WEST SIDE PREP, CHICAGO, ILL.

Ms. COLLINS. To the chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Marva Collins, teacher, founder, financial planner, bottle washer, diaper changer, curriculum planner of West Side Prep School in Chicago.

Mr. SIMON. And teacher of Shakespeare.

Ms. COLLINS. Teacher of a little of everything, the total child. I feel the teacher is a transient part of a permanent life of all students and that it is like being a moulder. We either mould very well once that child or individual comes to us; we either perform well or that person cannot perform as an adult.

I really feel teacher training institutions somehow need to teach less of theory, because to practice the philosophy of education does not teach a child to read, write, think, or compute.

I feel somehow we need to get back to some of the simplicity or put simplicity back into teacher training. It is like having all frills and desserts and not having the basic foods, the basic nutrients. I feel far too many children come out of school today with only the frills.

I think all things are fine if all things are equal, if the equanimity is there. I think it is ridiculous to put all the frills in education when children come out and cannot write a coherent sentence.

I often think many times teachers really have the desire to teach. I still have to find a teacher who wants to survive in the classroom for 6 hours, whatever, without knowing what to do. I feel as we know better, we do better. I feel the teacher training institutions have failed because when a teacher enters a classroom, they find that they have few or no skills with which really to move children because somehow right now there are only about six teacher training institutions that actually teach the phonetic method in schools.

How the look-say method ever came to be in our schools is beyond me. It is one of the mysteries of Western civilization, I suppose. Maybe the next generation will answer that.

But the look-say method was designed for children who are deaf. All of a sudden it became the mode in the schools for teaching reading. What children are actually doing is similar to giving each one of us a book of Portugese and asking us to read it. The decoding skills all of a sudden became poorer and poorer until I think that is what happens when many of the colleges do not give diplomas at graduation. They are afraid the parents might ask their children to read what is on the diploma.

I think reading is a privilege that is being denied many of us today. It is very embarrassing to read a speech, but I think that is a privilege that is denied many of us today. We see more and more students and I don't think it has ever been beyond any country's possibility to educate all people.

I think all of a sudden we have far too many children, far too many people who are not reading. We need to look back at the methodology that is being used in the teacher training institutions.

I realize that we do not have a society where all people can be doctors or Indian chiefs, lawyers, whatever. I do feel it is the inalienable right of all children to be able to read medicine labels, to be able to read a menu, to be able to read the daily newspapers, to be able to read children's report cards when they come home.

I think what we have done is a few years ago educators declared Johnny and Jane in America could read. Then all of a sudden the Federal funds came in vogue. We said maybe we do have a problem but nothing that a few more Federal dollars won't cure.

I somehow feel we continually put a band-aid on a hemorrhage. What is happening is, our society is constantly eroding.

It is affecting all of us. Teacher burnout actually comes about, I feel, because there is a teacher in a classroom trying to manage 20, 30, 40—whatever—children all day without having really the tools or the rudiments to get a job done.

It is like a plumber or a surgeon trying to perform an operation without the adequate tools. I think that we have to look back at our teacher training systems where, perhaps, teachers could have 2 years in the college, if we are going to continue with the 4-year program, and 2 years in the field.

I don't mean we have to go out and reconstruct everything, but we must do something soon or we all will suffer at the hands of our reluctance to act.

I feel that a teacher should have 2 years in college and 2 years actually teaching children. We have to look back at the teacher education programs because this is where all teachers were actually trained. This is where they get their training. Something has to be wrong when so many people are failing.

I would like to see teachers actually do 2 years in the classroom teaching, proving that they have the proficiency, that they have the skills to actually move children.

We have those teachers all across America, just in isolated sections; those teachers who have proven their proficiency in moving children. I see them as I go across America because this is how our school functions, doing the workshops, speaking engagements.

I see great teachers in some classrooms, then I see teachers two doors away or three doors away where there is just no learning going on; there is complete chaos. I think those teachers who have shown proficiency in moving children, those teachers who are creative enough to go beyond the curriculum, those teachers who do not rely on excuses; we did not learn this in college. Whether we learned it or not, it is our responsibility as we have these childrens' lives before us.

Not only do I see each child as a child, I see each child as a future parent. That is the seriousness with which I take it. I am not teaching one child, but perhaps—I say to each child, "you will eventually become a father." Boys will become fathers, girls mothers. We are talking about our educating genetic heirs for years and years to come, which I take as a serious task.

I somehow feel that it is not enough to have the two by four teacher who is just surrounded by the two covers of a book and the four walls of a room. There has to be an enthusiasm there. We have to attract those enthusiastic teachers somehow with a reward system, getting them for the first three grades.

All of a sudden we pay out huge amounts of moneys to getting a program started, to try a program. Then we raise more and more funds to remediate those same programs that did not work in the first place which to me it really seems ridiculous. Not only do we waste moneys, but we are also—more crucially than that—wasting lives, our entire future, the entire peace of this Nation.

The hydraheaded monster, if we look at it, starts back in the classroom; it all starts back with a good education.

I do not mean a surface education. It is the determination that I will be the captain of my own future. I will determine; I will survive if anyone else survives.

I think it is the kind of watered-down curriculums we have got then. We have taken all morality out of the schools today. Children come to us sophisticated. They come to school at five and have watched thousands and thousands of hours of television. They are very articulate. Children today are much more sophisticated than we were 30 or 40 years ago.

When they come to school, it is like a light going off. We have to vie with television. We have to become somehow, or elicit the same enthusiasm from a child watching television. We have to compete with that television set.

We have to be just that enthusiastic in the classroom. I think that is the kind of teacher that we will have to give greater rewards to. Those teachers should be paid more. They are perhaps, not just taken out or driven out of the school; they are pushed out the way poor students are because after a while a teacher who really cares and is really trying, finds he is working with the wind at his back.

Those people who somehow do not have that same impetus to do a good job, they find that they are becoming an alien camp. I think somehow the good teachers across America must be rewarded. We must somehow encourage the poor teachers to emulate them, whether it be through summer workshops, or whatever.

I think there should be a monetary reward, as in most professions. Those people tend to get ahead who do a better job. I think if we know that we are going to have tenure, and I am going to be paid for the same amount of work, whether I do the job or not, I think there is a lesser incentive for most people, or many people to get a good job done.

There certainly are great teachers in America. I think we need to look at what we already have and use that as a base for beginning to get their kind of enthusiasm into other teachers.

Mr. SIMON. What motivated you? How come Marva Collins suddenly emerges as such an unusual teacher? What got you moving in this direction? Do we see something there that we can reach for?

Ms. COLLINS. I'll tell you, if I knew that I wouldn't do it again. You may be sure of that.

One thing that I think I have always taken education with a very, very—first of all, my own three children. I have always felt that—and I think we need to stop looking at just public/private education. I think there are fantastic public schools. I think there are good public schools. Right now we are relying on good public education.

Teachers are not trained to go into public schools, private schools; they go into schools.

I think we need to realize and deal with reality here and not become immersed in a sea of words. What we say here really will not matter. It is what we are going to do here.

I think it is very important that we realize there are poor private schools; there are good private schools; there are many good public schools; there are bad public schools.

I think I left because—or I just felt that children could learn more than see Dick; see Jane.

I thought their minds were just a little too sophisticated to see Jimmy and Sue running through the book all day.

I felt children needed to realize that there are no free rides in this world. We teach them that life is just a bed of roses. When they are 15, 16, 17, we wonder what we are going to do with them.

I think it is important that they realize that anyone in America who has made contributions to America, who has made it, has had their obstacles, their problems.

Life is not that instant or frozen food that mother pops into the oven.

Life is not that instant pill we take to get instant relief.

I don't think we realize that children today have grown up very quickly. They see us take an aspirin for a headache or see us get a beer or whatever to relax. We do not realize that everything we do affects children. They watch so much.

I guess that is one reason I get along with them. I always realize they are much more sophisticated than most adults. They see things. They don't always say them. They have thoughts. They might be scattered, but their thoughts become well honed and well defined after a while. They know more what we are than we could ever say.

I just really feel that children know when we are in control. They know when we are well prepared. The teacher has to be like a fine Swiss watchmaker. You cannot flip through a book to decide what you are going to do that day. Every moment there has to be a marker there to know exactly where you are going to turn.

Children are children.

I saw far too many children being recruited for failure. I saw far too many children living in the area that I live in by choice and I refuse to live any place else. I saw far too many expectations so low for these children; they are not going to do anything anyway. I think we have to think of the Abraham Lincolns, the European immigrants, people who came to America where education was their only outlet.

Their parents could not read, write, compute, but they wanted it for their children, they were so proud when their children achieved.

I think it is none of my responsibility as an educator to decide that one of you as my students here is a little too inferior, or statistically a little too inferior to learn.

I think we should stop playing sociologists and aim for each child. We are paid for each child.

I say to my teachers for every child you do not reach, that child is subtracted from your check. That is one you have not reached, that is one you have not gone out to. I think we have to reach for each child.

I think those—people who really fail, through no fault of their own, I think it is through no fault of their own that we have not reached for them. I think that's true for far too many children. I know we are never going to reach all, that Utopia. We have never found the Utopia we constantly search for.

Far too many children are failing in all too many walks of life. In the last month I received 2,700 letters from parents. They are not from the lower economic bracket. They are from parents I would least expect to hear from. The most elite areas, the most sophisticated areas.

It says to me we are in trouble in education when we see the rise of teenage suicides, teenage drugs, alcoholism. I don't think we ever attribute it, as I said initially, back to the same hydraheaded monster in that classroom, of having good thoughts about myself, realizing things are not instantaneous and that man, since the beginning of time, has had his problems.

Only those people who have not succumbed to their problems succeed. It is very important we know what happened in the past so we will make the same mistakes and become like the dinosaur, extinct.

There has to be food for thought in that for all of us.

Mr. SIMON. Let me toss three questions at you.

No. 1, you were here and heard most of the testimony of the representatives of the schools of education. All of a sudden Marva Collins is named dean of the school of education.

What would you do with that school of education?

No. 2——

Ms. COLLINS. Let me take No. 1 first.

I am not very bright.

I think first of all, if I were dean of education, I would—that means that I would have to actually be a teacher. You cannot tell people what they should do unless you have been there yourself. I think that is one of the problems with the teacher training institutions. We have people training teachers who have never taught a day in their lives in the classroom.

First of all, I would never ask anyone to do anything. That is my philosophy. If you don't do it and do not get it done, I would do it myself.

I would never ask anyone to do anything I have no knowledge of myself. That is a respect people have for practioners.

I would revamp the curriculum so children learn to read phonetically, and we should get decent literature back into the schools, so Miss Piggy would not become the epitome of the New York Times best seller list.

I cannot imagine where our society is going when Miss Piggy becomes the image of womanhood. That is the first thing I would do, get commonsense back rather than the art, the jam, the sex education. So children know how to read, write, and spell those words, so children know how to think. Thinking is so crucial to the continued peace and success of our Nation.

Mr. SIMON. I think you have in part answered the second question. That is, what would you do if you were suddenly a member of the Chicago School Board, or Carbondale, Ill., School Board, or anywhere else?

Ms. COLLINS. First of all, I had those opportunities and did not take them. I tell you what I would do if I were there.

I would first of all get into the classrooms. You cannot sit behind a desk. You have to prove that you have the ability to get it right. Anyone can get a mass of facts written.

I would go into the classrooms not just sit behind a utopian desk.

How can I sit there and tell people in the Washington area—I have been to Washington 10, 12, 13 times but I am still not familiar with the needs of people in every neighborhood here.

It is easy to send out a mandate. That is why I think it is ridiculous. It is like buying a size 32 jacket for every man in this room. I think you have to be in a teaching capacity. Then I know what works. I know that I can do it. I cannot ask you to do it if I cannot prove that I can also do it.

That is the only way I can get the respect of my teachers. If they do not do it, they know that I will. I am always willing, but it is the titles we have gotten into. That is why I refuse the titles. I never list my degrees. I don't think that really matters.

What can Marva Collins do? I think that is the most important thing. I think somehow we have gotten lost, become immersed in a sea of rhetoric in America.

I don't think the talk is going to save any of us. I think it is really what has always worked and that is what people have done.

I would actually have to go into the classrooms to teach, into every section of the city. When I criticize, I would also have to have a better way of doing it.

Mr. SIMON. Finally, it relates to the Federal role. If there should be one. I have not had the privilege of visiting your school yet.

Ms. COLLINS. You may as well join the entourage. We had 3,000 visitors last year.

Mr. SIMON. I want to do it. I have visited schools in the inner city in Cincinnati that were exciting; right out here in Takoma Park, Md., and elsewhere.

It seems to be the general consensus here this morning that we do face a problem in attracting the people that we ought to be attracting in the field of teaching. What do we do about it? What do I, as a Member of Congress, do? What do my colleagues do for the Nation?

Is there something we should do or is this something better left to the neighborhoods of America?

Ms. COLLINS. First of all, I would like to commend you for the initiatory step. I think there has to be a beginning. I think nothing can be changed until it is faced. I think we have come to the first step. We have faced the reality we do have a problem. What we do about that problem, are we going to write a lot of materials, stack it away? Have I done my job? Are we going to implement some of the things that need to be looked into?

I think as a Member of Congress that somehow education, as someone said here initially, seems to have been a very low priority. None of us would be here—if we stop to reflect back on it none of us would be here if we could not read, write, think or compute. It is how we get the beginnings. It is the beginning of every profession.

I think somehow—education should be isometrical to defense.

If we don't have people literate enough to read directions and read instructions, to put our defense unit together, we will not have to talk about it.

We will not have defense to talk about. I think it is very important that somehow education is removed from the back burner and put in its proper perspective.

I think somehow it is very rarely that you hear about education on the news. It is the defense budget, this, that or all of the other things. It gets a low priority.

Yet it is the beginning, it is how this Nation was built. We certainly do not want it to be—I don't mean to cry doomsday cries, but as an American, and perhaps selfish, I certainly feel we need to do something about it before we wake up one day and the America known as a nation that works is an America that doesn't work.

I certainly think education must take a higher priority. I think the reciprocity that is somehow given to other units is just—I mean education is only something we talk about every once in a while. Then we really do not seem to have the same seriousness about it. We all want it for our individual children.

We all try to find the very best schools for our individual nieces, nephews. If we do not have our own children, we have a child dear to us.

I think that is the seriousness we have to take it with. I take it that way with the children I meet. If this were my child—my own children attend my school. That is why I initiated the school, for my children.

Going to fancy, expensive, $3,000, $4,000, $6,000 a year schools, they actually were not getting the kind of education they should have gotten. I initiated my own school.

Mr. SIMON. Were you trained as a teacher?

Ms. COLLINS. Yes, I was trained as a teacher, but I was not trained to do all of the things I am doing now.

I think that is what we mean by thinking. You rise to meet the need.

I think it is important that we cannot tell children you step here and there and don't step there because you might fall.

No one can set a map. No one gets a map to life. I think the thing that we tried to do is to teach the total child not just to read, write, or compute, but to think because once a child can think he rises to any occasion. They are able to rise to any occasion whatsoever.

If I decide to metamorphose from being a teacher today to becoming an engineer, it becomes my duty to find out about the engineering field regardless of how many hours it takes or regardless of what it takes.

Mr. SIMON. I thank you very much. As I indicated earlier, there's another subcommittee meeting on the air traffic controllers' strike today. I am sure there is television coverage and media coverage like mad there. I think what we have been discussing here today has infinitely more to do with the future of this country.

Ms. COLLINS. Certainly. I would hate to see a controller who could not read or did not know longitude or latitude or who says, "I guess this is right." Or "I suppose."

I would hate to have a surgeon who says, "I guess I am cutting 2 centimeters to the left."

I think it is a serious business and we take it seriously. That is why I say to children, you have to be exact. I say you cannot say I guess or I think she said the left femur. No, I am not sure. Maybe I better go 6 centimeters to the left.

It sounds comical, but it is not comical when it is us laying on the table there.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much.

Tomorrow morning we will meet in the same room at 9:30 and continue our hearings.

Thank you very, very much for your testimony.

The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 10, 1981.]

TEACHER PREPARATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1981

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:40 a.m., in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Paul Simon (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Simon and Coleman.

Staff present: William A. Blakey, counsel, and Betsy Brand, minority legislative associate.

Mr. Simon. The subcommittee hearing will resume.

We began hearings yesterday on a subject that has not been addressed by Congress up to this point, a subject on which as far as I know, none of the members of the subcommittee have any assumptions either as to what should be done, or even the extent of the problem. The problem very simply is that the test scores of those now in colleges suggest that our brightest students are not moving into the area of teaching.

The hearing yesterday and the hearing today is simply to determine, No. 1, do we have a problem, and No. 2, if there is a problem, how do we address it, and should the Federal Government be involved in any way in dealing with that problem.

Mr. Coleman, have you anything you would like to add at this point?

Mr. Coleman. Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simon. We are very pleased to have as our first witness, Dr. Vincent Reed, Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education. Anyone who has been in the Washington area for any length of time is familiar with the name Dr. Vincent Reed.

You may proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF VINCENT REED, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF EDUCATION FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Reed. I would like to have my statement submitted for the record.

Mr. Simon. It will be.

Mr. Reed. I am very pleased to appear before the subcommittee to address the problem of teacher education and retention of teachers.

It has been a concern of mine for a long time, and it is something that I think needs to be addressed by local school districts and local boards of education.

As you talk to teachers throughout this country and based on my experience in the District of Columbia, you find that teachers have a number of problems that we have forced upon them. One of the things that bothers me more than anything else is that we bring teachers in who have spent 22 years of their lives educating themselves to teach and immediately we, in some cases, turn them into classroom policemen. That seems to be one of the main concerns that teachers express and one of the concerns that we as administrators and educators are trying to come to grips with.

Teachers today complain vehemently about discipline. As a result of that many teachers have decided they no longer want to teach, that they are willing to take something with less financial support rather than put up with the very serious discipline problems they face in some school districts.

Another problem of major concern to teachers, particularly in large cities, is that of security. As educators we sit here and talk about education problems, and security should not be an educational problem, but it is in large cities, and I think we have to address that.

Take the District of Columbia, for instance, where you have 220 school buildings right in the heart of the city; many of the buildings are situated where you can step right off the sidewalk into the building. Because of fire regulations you are not permitted to lock any doors during the schoolday. Some buildings have 75 to 80 exits into the city. If the thugs come into the schools to rob, or to maim, or to inflict abuse and harm upon people, there is nobody in the schools trained to deal with these kinds of persons. Teachers are not trained to be policemen; contrary to what people believe, assistant principals and principals are not trained to be policemen. But you have these people in buildings trying to protect students and staff.

The police department tries to protect the citizens of our schools, but due to lack of personnel it is a job which is impossible for them to do because of other things they have to do in the city. So that is one of the many things teachers have to contend with.

The other problem is one of lack of student motivation. Many teachers feel so many students today do not want to learn, and they come in such large numbers teachers find it frustrating.

The other thing is the lack of parental involvement. Parents in large numbers do not seem to be interested in what is happening in schools. On those nights provided for parents to come in and sit down and talk with teachers about the progress of their children, the parents who come are not the parents who need to come. The parents of children with discipline problems and learning problems are hard to get to. Teachers find this very annoying, and it makes the job they are trying to do very complicated.

Teachers also complain about the amount of paperwork and administrative stress put upon them by the administration. In large school systems it can be a burdensome type of task to keep up with your classes and students every day and at the same time carry out the administrative kinds of duties heaped upon them by the school system.

There are a multitude of things that cause teachers to feel they no longer want to teach.

The bottom line to all of that, and the reason I mention this last, is because I do not think it is important that the salaries of teachers are not comparable to people in the private sector. Teachers feel they are being viewed as less than a priority as far as the community is concerned. And they are right to feel that way, because teachers put in a very rigorous day, 6½ to 7 hours, and then their day does not end when school closes. They go home to prepare for the next day. I can tell you of young teachers dealing with classes of bright youngsters who are almost at a point of tears because, as a teacher told me one time, she spent 6 hours preparing for this bright English class, and when she went to class the next day the students went through her work in 15 minutes, so she was sitting there with 30 minutes of nothing to do.

That old saying if you cannot do anything else, teach—I reject that. I think teaching is an honorable profession and one this country has been able to build itself on.

Not too long ago, there were 140 Presidental scholars visiting Washington as a part of being selected for the Presidental scholars program. Secretary Bell asked how many of them intended to go into teaching. I bet there were not 10 hands that went up. We are talking about the brightest minds in the country, and they do not want to go into teaching. I think we have to make teaching more attractive. I think school boards have to be more positive with youngsters who are disruptive. They should be removed from the classroom. I do not think any youngster has the right to deny any other youngster the right to an education because they take so much of the teacher's time.

For teachers who have just come from teacher institutions, I do not think anyone expects them to be master teachers. School systems have to have a program where they can place these teachers in an on the job training program. So many districts do not have programs where they can take these teachers and train them to be master teachers.

I think good teachers are actors, they are on stage, and they have to feel comfortable that the school system will allow them to use whatever tools they bring with them. I think on the job training is something we have to look at. I think school systems have to review how they hire teachers. In the District of Columbia they are embarking on a new program of three-step certification: First, a teacher must have finished an accredited college or university; second, a teacher must submit to a written examination in his or her certified area; and third, the teacher must demonstrate his or her ability to teach in a simulated classroom on videotape.

As they go through that process, it gives them a better chance to take a more rounded look at the people they are bringing on, hopefully screening out some of the people who do not show positive signs of becoming a good teacher.

Contrary to what might be the belief, everyone who comes from a teaching institution is not qualified to teach. They hope to weed those persons out. The fact is, if we make our teachers feel secure, make them feel as if teaching is a priority in this country and pay them as if it is a priority, then hopefully we will keep those teachers in the classroom who are master teachers. Then we can solve one of the problems we are now facing.

I have to add, things vary from community to community because of the uniqueness of those communities, but there is a common thread, people need to feel like they are somebody and they will want to teach.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Dr. Reed.

Do you sense that those going into teaching today, those who are studying, if all the test data is accurate, are the students who do not rank at the top in SAT scores, in fact, they are down at the bottom? Is that a problem compared to 10 years ago, or 20 years ago, if I can go back into your—if I can assume you were an observer of the scene 20 years ago? In other words, are we slipping, or do the conditions that you describe show we are holding our own? Is this something that this Congress and local communities ought to be concerned about, teacher education institutions, or is it not a major problem?

Mr. REED. I think we are graduating top students from our institutions. I am not sure we are making teaching attractive enough to draw them into teaching.

We know in the last 14 years on a general nationwide basis, the verbal SAT scores have dropped 49 points, and 32 points in the math. That is a fact.

I am not sure that the SAT score is the right barometer as to who is the best student.

We are more than ever in competition with private industry. Take math for example. It is hard for a school system to staff their schools with math teachers. If that person has obtained any kind of skills in math, private industry offers them a salary far beyond what they can make in a school district.

The other thing, as we talk about some of the problems with teaching, we could provide incentives to attract those who may want to go into teaching. To answer your question, you are right, we are not getting enough of the best people, and it is due to the conditions that exist in some of our school systems.

Mr. COLEMAN. Will we have questions now, or have all the witnesses come back and then ask questions?

Mr. SIMON. You may ask questions at this time.

Mr. COLEMAN. As you know, Congress has been involved and several of the teaching programs have been made into block grants, Teacher Corps, et cetera. Because of that, what do you think is now the role for the Federal Government to be involved in, in turning back some of these programs to be administered on State and local levels?

Mr. REED. I think the Federal Government has to make sure that everyone has equal access to educational opportunities regardless of race, creed, or ability to speak the English language.

I think the present Department of Education has a responsibility to review what is being done around the country, to look at what has been successful, collect that data and make it available to those States who are desirous of it, and to offer technical assistance and make sure the people we have in the Department are trained to give technical assistance to the States and school districts who ask for it.

I spoke to a Governors' Conference in Oklahoma yesterday, and they are very concerned about the quality of education in the State of Oklahoma. I see that happening in other States.

It seems to me the block grants will give State and local school boards an opportunity to set priorities and put the money where it is most needed. The Federal Government must stand by and give assistance, but at the same time, not interfere with these programs.

Mr. **Coleman**. If you had to say one thing, what would be the top priority in teacher education today?

Mr. **Reed**. That teaching institutions make sure they stay on top of the needs of the teaching profession and train teachers to meet those needs.

I find so often, teachers who have been through teacher training and practice training have been placed with the best teachers and best children, so when they come out, they are shocked; it is a shocking experience for a young teacher to walk into an inner city school and look at a group of kids who say, here we are, we dare you to teach us.

We have to be more realistic in preparing our teachers to teach and to meet whatever may confront them. I am not saying every classroom you walk into is a frightening experience, but it is frightening to walk into a classroom for the first time and not have anyone to pick you up if you fall.

Mr. **Coleman**. You indicated the District is going through preemployment examinations. Do you feel that is something that should be on a State-by-State basis?

Mr. **Reed**. I think it was good for the District.

Mr. **Coleman**. Do you support a mandatory minimum passage of a test?

Mr. **Reed**. I think every State has to make that decision. I felt the District of Columbia needed that three-phase certification in order to get better teachers. I think teachers should be able to put in writing their strong points, and I think teachers have to demonstrate their ability to teach. I think the written examination is important.

Mr. **Coleman**. In your position, do you have any opportunity to provide any subjective views of your own to the States as to whether or not this is a good phenomenon? Obviously you feel for this situation, in the District, that it is. Do you get into that part? Do you give your own personal view?

Mr. **Reed**. If I am asked, yes.

Mr. **Coleman**. That is, that you feel these are positive criteria and a good thing to have.

Mr. **Reed**. They are not the only ones but they are some worth trying out.

Mr. **Coleman**. Last week's U.S. News & World Report had some articles devoted to public education. The editorial page of this magazine indicated some of our problems of our inability to read and write in this country are based upon lack of phonetic training in our schools, and that we have 23 million functionally illiterate adults in this country, and of course the cost to the country is tremendous.

They suggest that perhaps one of the reasons phonetics is opposed and the profession being opposed is because textbook publishers fear losing a million-dollar business.

Do you feel this is valid, there are people who stand to lose dollars, therefore they are not giving us what is necessary?

Mr. REED. I think every school district has to demand from textbook publishers what they want. I do not think any school district of any size has to bend to what is being printed. School districts spending $3 or $4 million a year on textbooks can print their own textbooks.

I think there has been a move to say to publishers, we want this particular textbook. We went through that phase when we were talking about blacks being involved in the history books and having indicated in the history books the kinds of things they contribute to this country at the time of the event. We told the textbook companies, we will not buy these books unless they have printed into the textbooks the contributions made by blacks. The textbook companies went back and did that.

We also said to them, if you do not do that, we will not purchase your books.

I think most school districts have within the population of their districts those who can produce their own textbooks and other kinds of periodicals and pamphlets. I do not think school districts have to be dictated to by textbook publishers.

Mr. COLEMAN. So, you feel there is enough leverage there?

Mr. REED. I think there is, if you bite the bullet, but that is the bottom line to everything we do in education. If you have enough intestinal fortitude to do it. But the problem I find is, we do not have enough people who have the grit to do what needs to be done if it is unpopular. That is true not only in education, but everywhere.

Mr. COLEMAN. Do you in your position work with textbook publishing companies on availability of materials or make any suggestions?

Mr. REED. In the Department of Education, no, sir.

Mr. COLEMAN. Is there such a function?

Mr. REED. Not in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Mr. COLEMAN. Do you know if there is such a function in the Department?

Mr. REED. I do not know of any.

Mr. COLEMAN. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned on-the-job training possibilities. Yesterday some of our witnesses suggested having in our teacher training institutions the kinds of situations similar to those when training the physician, that you are out for 1 year, under supervision working with someone directly. Is some kind of a change like that—I am not suggesting the Federal Government get involved—but that kind of direction, is that a desirable thing?

Mr. REED. Yes, it is.

I know in most law schools, they have a clinical requirement where fourth-year law students go out and work in the community.

I think that would be important for the teachers. I think it would be more important than taking education 303, to go out and live education 303.

I think the school systems have to be sensitive to the fact that they have a responsibility to train teachers, as well as to develop students. If they train students and teachers properly, they will enhance the learning of those students.

I think after maybe 10 years, there should be a system where teachers are given a year off to study and be paid the same salary they were being paid during the 10th year, so they can go back to school to update their teaching skills.

Mr. SIMON. Do you know of any school districts that do that?

Mr. REED. I do not know of any. I had toyed with the idea and I have talked to Secretary Bell about it. As soon as the Department settles down a bit, we plan to look into some kind of initiative.

The majority of teachers are female. They go to school, put in a full day's work, go home and do more work. The female has to go home, be a mother, prepare for the next day and you expect her to come back and give 100 percent. It is not possible. We have to devise some method to give teachers a break from the classroom, to rejuvenate them.

If we can give a teacher a year off after 10 years of service, then after an additional 10 years, she has another year off, then she has 10 more years, and after 30 years, she can retire. Those breaks are needed because teaching is a hard job, harder than working in a steel mill or carrying a hod of bricks. When you are mentally tired, you are far more tired than if you are physically tired.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much, Dr. Reed, for being here.

[The prepared statement of Vincent Reed follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF VINCENT E. REED, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you this morning about the problems of teacher education and retention in our public schools. My comments are based upon many years of experience as an educator—as a teacher, a principal, a director of manpower, an associate superintendent and as superintendent of the District of Columbia schools.

Many people in this country think public education costs too much and that we are not getting what we pay for. Taxpayers are confronted with steadily increasing costs in education at the same time we are seeing that money alone is not the answer. We have all read articles and heard speeches about the problems confronting our schools today. Among the most evident and difficult to solve are student discipline, lack of emphasis on academic excellence, teaching and mastery of basic skills, and what some call teacher "burnout". I believe that the solutions to all of these problems are related to a positive school climate—to an environment in which achievement and excellence are rewarded, for students and teachers.

Creating such a climate is not an easy task. As with other segments of our life, we tend to deal best with crises—with those problems that demand our immediate attention and which we can eliminate with superficial, quick treatments. Thus, we expend our energies and our dollars on short-term solutions which, like the band-aids they are, do nothing to solve the cause of the problem.

The success or failure of the American education system depends on its teachers. Even with plenty of money, parental involvement and sound educational planning, teachers alone make the difference in motivating children and in providing a fundamental understanding of the importance of education in our lives. The impact that one good teacher can have on one student may positively influence that student throughout his or her life.

Conversely, the impact of one bad teacher is no less lasting. What this says is that teachers have an awesome responsibility and that in order to deal well with this responsibility they must be carefully selected and trained.

I do not believe that everyone can be a good teacher, regardless of the amount of training and interest. On the other hand, all teachers can benefit from training which goes beyond mastery of subject matter and prepares them for what will occur in the actual classroom setting. Schools of education have done little to prepare teachers for the harsh realities of teaching—discipline problems, lack of interest, varying achievement levels, parental apathy, lack of basic educational equipment, outdated or irrelevent curricula, burdensome paperwork and a host of other problems dealing with social problems that students bring to school. More importantly, aspiring teachers are not prepared for a society which takes them for granted and which recognizes their shortcomings, not their accomplishments. This is a basic component of the teacher retention problem. It is true that if schools of education dealt more openly and more directly with classroom problems, they may turn out fewer teachers, but those who completed the training would enter the field better prepared and less inclined to become quickly dissatisfied and leave the profession.

The next step in dealing with teacher retention problems occurs in the recruitment and selection phase. I know of no school district which has all of its teachers teaching only those subjects in which they majored in school. In fact, some teachers seem to have a natural talent for teaching and the subject matter is of little consequence to them or their students. However, as long as students leave universities with areas of specialization, it makes good sense to hire teachers in their specialty area, whenever possible. This initial pairing of skills and positions means that teachers will be less likely to leave a school or district simply to take another position which is in their specialty area.

The recruitment and selection process is the first opportunity a superintendent has to convey the important of training, standards, and excellence in education. The hiring of new teachers must conform to these objectives if they are to have validity in the future. In addition, the same standards must be applied to personnel already in the system. Performance standards must be clear, consistent and developed in consultation with those to whom they are applied. Training to upgrade skills must be available and opportunities for acquiring new skills must also be provided.

As with students, achievement and excellence must be recognized and rewarded, not on special once a year occasions, but throughout the year as the accomplishments occur. This recognition relates again to a positive school climate, the third phase of a solution to the problem of teacher retention. As parents rejoin with teachers and students to involve the entire community in education, teachers will see an increased appreciation of their role in the public education system. This, in turn, leads to increased self-esteem and a more positive view of the teaching profession, as well as a sense of excitment over the job to be performed.

The problem of teacher retention will not be solved overnight and we will no doubt continue to see good teachers leave the ranks. However, as we raise our expectations and our standards for students, we will do the same for teachers. There are many teaching now who can meet and often exceed those standards. Properly rewarded, they can serve as role models and incentives for others. Those who do not meet the standards should have opportunities for training and upgrading of skills, but accountability cannot vary from individual to individual. We must set our standards and work toward them without losing sight of our goal—students who are well prepared to take their place in our complex, changing society.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Committee today. I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

Mr. SIMON. The next witness is Dr. Milton Goldberg. If you would like to enter your statement in the record and summarize, you may do that.

STATEMENT OF MILTON GOLDBERG, ACTING DIRECTOR, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDBERG. I would like to do that.

Mr. SIMON. Without objection.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I want to affirm what Dr. Reed has said about some of the things that teachers face in the schools and the reasons for those conditions. There are certain issues that confront us in education today that need to be understood. For the time being at least, we are facing declining enrollments across the country. We may face a period in the not too distant future when that might change, but today we are facing declining enrollments and we are facing serious layoffs in teacher systems across the country.

Second is the issue of the tasks teachers are expected to perform. The fact of the matter is that the old conception of the teacher transmitting a somewhat traditional curriculum is not entirely accurate today. We have gone through a period and I think to a considerable degree are in that period, where teachers are expected to, and must, confront issues like drug and alcohol abuse, environmental conditions, the severe paperwork requirements, and other conditions that make it more difficult for the teacher to focus on what we consider to be the traditional role of the teacher, which is transmitting knowledge and learning to the schools.

Finally, one other major point that I think is reflected by this last issue is the whole matter of schools mirroring the society.

Schools traditionally have been mirrors of the society. To the degree that our society reflects, if you will, a splintering of family and a questioning of values, and what kinds of values are important, a society which may question the role of authority, all of those characteristics, as well as many others, are reflected in schools.

There is no one individual who suffers the brunt of those changing conditions more than a teacher.

What I would like to do now, if I may, is talk about some of the things we have learned at NIE and elsewhere in the country on a basis of research others have done, as to the characteristics of teachers today—some you have referred to yourself, Mr. Simon, the characteristics of people coming into teaching today, and also issues as to teacher retention.

First, let me affirm some of the things that have been said; that as a matter of fact the aptitude scores have declined and have declined considerably. The math scores declined from 449 to 418. The average verbal scores declined from 418 to 339, a precipitous drop.

While there have been drops in other fields as well, they are not as severe as the drop in the field of teaching.

Of 19 fields of study for entering college freshmen analyzed by the American College Testing Service—which provides a testing service similar to the SAT—education was tied for 17th place in math scores and 14th place in English scores.

A national longitudinal study sample of graduating high school seniors in the class of 1976 indicates that prospective education majors were 14th out of 16 fields of study in SAT verbal scores, and 15th out of 16 in mathematics.

The story Dr. Reed told about the Presidental scholars was one that the Secretary has talked about a great deal. He was most concerned when this large number of Presidential scholars was asked, when they finished high school, how many were going into teaching. You could count on the fingers of one hand those who expressed interest in going into the profession.

The picture is equally bleak at the end of 4 undergraduate years: Verbal and nonverbal scores on the Graduate Record Examination have declined significantly since 1970.

There are other statistics which my testimony refers to, and I will leave that for your reading.

I do want to make one extra point related to all of this, that has to do with the effect on the decline of distinguishing between male and female high school graduates. The fact of the matter is that much of the decline can be found among young women planning on entering teaching. What that means is that talented young women, who form the core of the teaching profession, are turning to other fields where they have greater opportunities than they ever had before, law, medicine, the sciences.

Academically able young women who once contributed to raising the average scores of people entering the teaching profession are entering other fields. We have not yet provided the kinds of enhancements that would be necessary to change that trait.

Let me talk for a minute about those who are leaving teaching, the teacher dropout question.

Now, while we have a lot of intuitive information, if you will, intuitive sense about this issue—I, like Dr. Reed, have spent most of my personal life in public education, so I have some personal sense of why people leave teaching—there has been relatively little study of the issue. But one major study examined the attrition rates of all North Carolina teachers between 1973 and 1980. On average, the findings were the following: (1) Only one-half of those who had started teaching 7 years before were still teaching in 1980; (2) Two-thirds of those in the bottom 10 percent of the NTE test were still teaching, compared with only one-third of those in the top 10 percent. With regard to the second finding, the results were remarkably consistent: Regardless of race or sex, the higher the NTE score when the teacher began teaching, the less likely that teacher was to be in the classroom 7 years later.

So that means even when the profession was able to attract people of high caliber, the ability to retain those people after a number of years began to decrease.

You might ask where are those teachers going? I should point out, a number do not leave the profession, but they get into other aspects of education which in terms of status or salary are more attractive. They end up in school administration buildings as supervisors and other such positions.

But, again, as I made the point earlier about women in the profession, there are other opportunities for people in the profession, and people from the profession find it easy to get jobs in community colleges. There are colleges and universities, when there was more flexibility in terms of staffing, which looked for people who were high-caliber master teachers to attract to their own staffs.

Research and development centers have sought more and more, people who are able to combine good teaching experience with educational research.

There are teachers who leave to go into service and sales occupations in the private sector.

The corporate world is very attractive to math and science teachers, and they are finding positions in those areas.

Now, let me mention a couple of other issues related to this whole business of teacher attention before I move on to some new directions that I think we might be looking at, that I think we need to consider.

First, as I indicated earlier, although there is at present an oversupply of teachers, that is not true in all areas in all fields.

For instance, communities in the West and Southwest, witnessing growth as a result of oil and energy development, are experiencing serious teacher shortages in some subjects.

Second, school districts find certain teachers almost impossible to hire: mathematicians, scientists, bilingual teachers, and experts in certain areas of special education. Those people are prizes.

It is my understanding, and I do not have exact data on this, that there are a number of States in this country that have been unable to graduate a single physics teacher to teach in the high school.

Third, today's oversupply may well turn to a shortage in 10 years as the result of a decline in the past decade in the number of students completing teacher education programs. What we are facing is a kind of Catch-22. People are not going into teaching as much as they used to because of some of the things I have already said to you; and enrollments are declining. Therefore, people are being let go in systems around the country. So what we have are fewer people going in and more people leaving, but as a result of that, a decade from now, we could have a teacher shortage.

It is our understanding over the last 10 years the number of education majors completing undergraduate work has fallen by 50 percent.

Because fewer new teachers have been trained and even fewer are able to find jobs, the teaching force itself is aging. The result of that is that the salaries of teachers are higher now, because there are more teachers tenured, more teachers at the top of the salary scale, and the burnout question which Vincent Reed referred to is more and more common because there are more people in the system who have been teaching for longer periods.

Finally, I want to point out that there are districts across this country that typically have the hardest time finding excellent teachers. For example, there are urban areas with high concentrations of low-income youngsters which still have a hard time attracting the best teachers because many of those people can transfer out and into suburban schools where there are better working conditions and better schools.

I would like to talk, Mr. Simon, about two directions we should address: One is the preservice training and inservice training.

With regard to preservice training, the issues I have just described, including the qualifications of those entering educational institutions, the quality of the training provided to them, and their certification as competent to teach in the classroom, are almost entirely issues in the hands of the institutions themselves, or of State and local educational agencies and national accrediting bodies.

State leaders, deans of colleges of education, and professionals concerned with the quality of teacher preparation have suggested a number of ways in which teacher education and credentialing might be improved, ranging from requiring successful passage of entry-level qualifying examinations, to completing a 1-year internship for the new teacher, similar to the training a physician receives, in effect adding an additional year to the aspiring teacher's training. And some of the kinds of things that Dr. Reed referred to.

There have been recommendations as to specialized tests, for example: First, tests of basic subject matter competence, that is, mathematics; and second tests of skill in teaching. At least 15 States now require some form of teacher competency testing, and 6 of those require the national teachers examination.

There have been some examples, by the way, that have created an affirmation of why some of these tests may be essential.

Half of a sample of first-year teachers in Dallas failed a test of verbal ability, and half of Houston's applicants scored lower than the average high school junior in mathematics.

While those skills are crucial to effective teaching, I do not think they are the only skills that are essential, and I do believe we do not know how to test very effectively for some of those other skills, those skills which have to do with interpersonal relationships, with how to deal with large and small groups, and how to deal with diversity in general.

I think that one of the most promising developments in preservice education today is the fact that many teacher training institutions are working more closely with local school districts. There are instances where school districts and institutions are cooperatively planning their programs so the practical experiences provided will be much more like the ones they meet once they get into the classroom.

I think we need to learn more about these experiences and make that information more widely available to people across the country.

I would like to take 1 more minute if I may to talk about the 2 to 2½ million teachers in our classrooms right now.

There is an enormous amount that should be done with the whole area of inservice education. A lot of teachers look at inservice education with distaste because a lot of those programs have been developed without adequate sensitivity to the real problems that teachers face on a day-to-day basis. Unless they see some connection between the training and the experience, it will not be useful. I want to refer to a piece of research that I believe offers new possibilities. I do not want to suggest this is the only piece of research that needs to be explored, but this piece, I think, offers special possibilities. We supported some research at the Institute and elsewhere on two general questions as to what makes an effective school and what constitutes effective teaching.

Now, the result of these two lines of inquiry are similar, but to summarize these findings—and I must say you may find these even annoyingly self-evident, but the fact is we have the research that supports it. These are our findings:

Keep the students engaged in academic tasks;

Use highly structured questions in order to elicit a relatively high rate of correct answers from students;

Provide immediate, academically oriented feedback to students, encouraging correct answers and exploring incorrect ones;

Accurately diagnose student skill levels, monitor student performance with frequent assessments, and individualize these assessments; and finally, Generally expect that students will do well and let them know of those expectations.

These are rhetorical judgments, characteristics of people we find who seem to be succeeding in the classroom.

We have been supporting a major multiyear study in California for the California Teacher Licensing Commission which began as an effort to identify desirable teacher characteristics so that the commission, at whose request the study began, could look for those characteristics in new teachers.

We found in that study that fifth-grade students, random fifth-grade students, receive over the course of the year, 5,000 minutes of instruction in reading comprehension, compared with other students using the same textbooks, same curriculum, in the same grade and same school system, who were getting 1,000 minutes, five times as much in some classrooms as others. The reason apparently was that teachers vary enormously as to the amount of time they can provide on academic tasks. The reason, there are a lot of other things to do. They have to take roll, moving from one activity in the same class to another, getting out books, preventing students from talking and daydreaming—all of these things eat into the few minutes available to the teacher. Good teachers keep students engaged; the less successful teachers are busy coping with disruptions.

Training programs were developed out of that research, which enabled the teacher to take a hard look at the way he or she spends time on teaching and then tries to improve the amount of time actually spent teaching reading to kids. We have one major example of the effects of that. The Austin, Tex., school district, knowing of the results of this academic time on task research, verified that the California experience was also true in Austin. After overcoming widespread disbelief on the part of the faculty regarding the accuracy of the findings, the district mounted a districtwide program to help schools and teachers increase the amount of time actually allocated for learning as well as the amount of engaged learning time.

The Austin schools estimate they have added $4 million worth of instructional time for Austin's title I children without spending one additional dollar or lengthening the school day. In other words, the Austin school children are now getting more reading instruction than before because the teachers have been trained to use the research.

I do not want to oversimplify this very, very complex business. It seems clear the teachers are facing a difficult assignment, and I think we are properly concerned about those entering the teaching force, but I must point out there are hundreds of thousands of effective and totally committed people working today trying very hard to do a good job against difficult circumstances.

I think we ought to work to improve and maintain the skills of those people while at the same time trying to improve our preservice programs. I believe the utilization of research, information, and the sharing of successful practices across school districts and colleges of education and so on are some ways we might work on that.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Milton Goldberg follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MILTON GOLDBERG, ACTING DIRECTOR, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I am Milton Goldberg, Acting Director of the National Institute of Education, and I appreciate the opportunity to participate in these important hearings on the status of teachers today, including their preparation and retention.

As a teacher and administrator in the public school system in Philadelphia for 25 years, I experienced first-hand both the joys and frustrations of teaching, and it is a truism to state that on the shoulders of teachers rest both heavy burdens and great opportunities.

Yet teachers, the first line in our effort to impove the quality of education in this society, are under attack now as never before. In June of last year, Time magazine's cover read "Help! Teacher Can't Teach." This April's Newsweek focused on teachers in its cover story, "Public Schools are Flunking." And in April, also, the Washington Post published a lengthy piece entitled "Faulty Teaching Fails Children."

It is perhaps, inevitable that the public has come to view the teaching profession and its membership with increasing skepticism and that the crisis of confidence in American education has been laid at the teacher's door.

Concerns about test score decline, school discipline problems, and the lack of motivation in young people, are frequently attributed to teachers who are often derided as bureaucratic, tenured, union activists, unwilling to discard demonstrably weak practices in favor of promising new techniques.

But before we accept that picture, I think it wise to remind ourselves that each of us probably had the benefit of at least one exceptional teacher during our time in school, and that there are still many outstanding teachers going to extraordinary lengths to motivate classes, often in the face of nearly overwhelming difficulties and frustrations.

I want today to focus upon three concerns: (1) a portrait of the average teacher today, including the conditions under which they work; (2) then I want to touch upon what we know about the quality of those now planning on entering the teaching profession as well as those leaving it; (3) finally, I want to briefly mention proposals to improve both pre and inservice teacher education.

THE TEACHER TODAY

Last year, the National Center for Educational Statistics estimated that there are 2,430,000 classroom teachers in our Nation's elementary and secondary schools, with slightly over 10 percent of that total in non-public institutions.

Contrary to the popular accounts, they are an extremely hard-working group: elementary school instructors average 44 hours each week, and secondary school teachers, 48 hours, in activities directly related to instruction, that is to say, teaching before a classroom, preparing lesson plans, and correcting homework. In addition, teachers are expected to help monitor lunchrooms, attend teacher meetings, and lead activities such as chorus and the yearbook.

They are well prepared in terms of academic backgrounds. Sixty-two percent possess the bachelor's degree, and 34 percent the master's degree.

The average teacher today is 37 years old, has been teaching for eight years, and earns $11,800 on average at the elementary level and $12,196 at the secondary level for the 9-month school year. Not to put too fine a point on the issue: those are hardly generous salaries for individuals with 5 to 6 years of training beyond high school and 5 to 10 years experience.

Teachers today have a much different job than the one I undertook three decades ago when I stood in front of my first classroom.

I do not want to overstress the differences because the basic teaching function has not changed greatly in the last generation.

That is to say that schools today are organized much as they have always been: age-graded, self-contained classrooms, with individual teachers instructing groups of children. The textbook and the blackboard continue to be the primary technology of teaching, and instruction is still largely teacher-centered and teacher-dominated.

Nevertheless, the environment for teaching has changed in significant ways.

Declining enrollments undercut the job security once offered in the teaching profession. Last week's Washington Post carried a story of the insecurity local teachers experience as they receive annual notices that their contracts may not be renewed for the following year. One eight-year veteran of the Arlington County schools—by all indications, an extremely competent teacher recently elected president of the teacher's association—described the anxiety she experienced with the arrival of this notice each Spring, and stated that she was getting out of teaching.

Additional tasks have been added to both the curriculum and the miscellaneous activities expected of teachers. Not only are they expected to transmit the "traditional" curriculum which most of us encountered, but also to deal with new concerns such as metric education, environmental issues, drug and alcohol abuse, and other new problems in society. Moreover, these demands come on top of more severe requirements in terms of additional paperwork and increased assessment and evaluation of students.

Schools mirror society and the crisis of authority in our homes and communities has its counterpart in the schools. According to NIE's Safe Schools, Violent Schools, each month one out of four teachers is either threatened, assaulted, or robbed in the school. When I started teaching, the teacher's authority in the classroom, with few exceptions, was unquestioned. Today, it is openly questioned by students who regularly challenge, defy, or ignore it.

The school population has changed in ways that most of us would agree is for the better, in terms of increased diversity. Nevertheless, the traditional teaching force has been poorly trained to cope with changes such as those required by desegregation, mainstreaming of handicapped children, and the addition of new groups of children with limited ability in English. In addition, students who were earlier suspended or expelled—discipline problems, or pregnant teenagers—now assert their rights to continue to receive services from the public schools, and, quite rightly, they are receiving them.

Mr. Chairman, I cite these statistics on what we know about the typical teacher, and the conditions under which they perform their task, not because there is anything startling or novel about this information. Most of us are vaguely aware of the changes in the condition of teaching, as well as the fact that teacher's salaries are not, on average, what they might be, and that there is a middle-aged bulge in the teaching profession.

I cite them because I have been asked to discuss the quality of those planning on entering teaching as well as those who are leaving it. On both sides of that equation there is some disquieting news: on average, those entering are not terribly promising, and those leaving it are among the best in the profession. But I want to suggest that the fault may lie not in the profession, but in the rewards available to those in it.

The salary averages I quoted at the outset are certainly not an incentive to enter teaching, much less stay in it.

The psychological satisfaction a teacher enjoyed as a respected member of the community, whose voice was unchallenged in the classroom, is simply a thing of the past.

Job prospects do not encourage young high school graduates to aspire to be teachers, and even established teachers worry each Spring about the prospects for the following year. It may be true that none of us, can expect much in the way of job security these days. But I believe the point I am trying to make still possesses some merit: job security was once one of the advantages of teaching; it no longer is.

THE ASPIRING TEACHER

Mr. Chairman, the evidence NIE has collected in the last year on the quality of those entering and planning to enter teaching is sobering. Put briefly, the academic ability of education majors is both low and declining, and teaching appears to be attracting the least academically able students.

To take, first, those high school graduates planning to major education as undergraduates:

Between 1972 and 1982, average verbal scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) among entering education majors, declined from 418 to 339; average SAT math scores fell from 449 to 418—both declines steeper than the average drop of 20 points in both verbal and math scores experienced overall by all majors;

Of 19 fields of study for entering college freshmen analyzed by the American College Testing Service (which provides a testing service similar to the SAT) education was tied for 17th place in math scores and 14th place in English scores;

A National Longitudinal Study sample of graduating high school seniors in the class of 1976 indicates that prospective education majors were 14th out of 16 fields of study in SAT verbal scores, and 15th out of 16 in mathematics.

The picture is equally bleak at the end of four undergraduate years:

Verbal and nonverbal scores on the Graduate Record Examination have declined significantly since 1970;

Scores on the Educational Testing Service's National Teacher Examination—an eight hour test of general knowledge, specific subject matter, and teaching techniques—declined between 1970 and 1975;

In 1975, Graduate Examination results for education majors were lower than those of eight other professional fields compared.

Mr. Chairman, before I turn my attention to the evidence we have on the quality of those leaving teaching, I do want to make the point that a large part, if not all, of the decline in the quality of those high school seniors planning on entering teaching can be accounted for by distinguishing between male and female high school graduates.

Most of the decline is found among the young women planning on entering teaching. That does not mean that the SAT results of women, in general, have declined precipitously; what it does mean is that talented young women who used to plan on entering teaching are now turning increasingly to other fields in which opportunities have opened up to them in the past decade: law, medicine, business, and the sciences. To put it another way: academically-able young women who once contributed to raising the average scores of entering education majors are now entering other fields.

TEACHER DROPOUTS

The evidence we have available on the quality of those leaving teaching is very slim, but it does seem to indicate that the teaching profession is losing some of its most capable members.

We have available only one recent study examining the quality of those leaving teaching.

A recent study examined the attrition rates of all North Carolina teachers between 1973 and 1980. On average, the findings were the following: (1) only one-half of those who had started teaching 7 years before were still teaching in 1980; and (2) two-thirds of those in the bottom 10 percent of the NTE test were still teaching after 7 years, compared with only one-third of those in the top ten percent. With regard to the second finding, the results were remarkably consistent: regardless of race or sex, the higher the NTE score when the teacher began teaching, the less likely that teacher was to be in the classroom seven years later.

You might well ask where these classroom teachers are going. I suspect that many of them are following the traditional route of teachers out of the classroom, that is, they are going into administration at the school and school district level.

But in the last 15 to 20 years, new opportunities have also opened up for teachers: the transition to community college instruction is relatively easy for highly academically trained secondary school teachers, careers are available in administration at colleges and universities, research and development centers, and in service and sales occupations in the private sector.

In addition, the corporate world is attractive to teachers trained in mathematics and science and may in part account for the severe shortage of such teachers at the secondary school level.

OTHER ISSUES

Before suggesting some possible remedies for the problems I have been outlining, I do want to mention a few other teacher workforce issues that appear significant.

First, although there is a general oversupply of teachers, that is not true in all areas and all fields.

Communities in the West and Southwest, witnessing burgeoning growth as a result of oil and energy development, are experiencing serious teacher shortages in all subjects.

Second, school districts find certain teachers almost impossible to hire: mathematicians, scientists, bilingual teachers, and experts in certain areas of special education.

Third, today's oversupply may well turn to a shortage in ten years as the result of a decline in the past decade in the number of students completing teacher education programs: over the last ten years the numbers of education majors completing college has fallen by 50 percent.

Fourth, because fewer new teachers are being trained, and even fewer are able to find jobs, our teaching force is aging, with the result that it is more expensive since teahers are tenured and at the top of the salary scale.

Finally, I want to point out that those districts most in need of excellent teachers are having the hardest time finding them. Urban areas, with the highest concentrations of low income, disadvantaged youngsters, find that teachers are transferring out of their schools, because suburban schools are able to offer better salaries and working conditions.

NEW DIRECTIONS

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there are two issues in this entire situation of concern to the teaching profession and those interested in improving it. The first has to do with the preparation and training of teachers in their undergraduate and graduate programs—what professionals in this field call pre-service training. The second has to do with the continuous upgrading and renewal of the skills of the 2.4 million teachers already in the classroom.

With regard to pre-service training, the issues involved here, including the qualifications of those entering schools of education, the quality of the training provided to them, and their certification as competent to teach in the classroom, are almost entirely issues in the hands of the institutions themselves, or of state and local educational agencies and national accrediting bodies.

State leaders, deans of colleges of education, and professionals concerned with the quality of teacher preparation, have suggested a number of ways in which teacher education and credentialling might be improved ranging from requiring successful passage of entry-level qualifying examinations, to completing a one-year internship for the new teacher, similar to the training a physician receives, in effect, adding an additional year to the aspiring teacher's training. Entry level examinations involves testing either before students receive their degree, or before they are hired. Two types of tests are frequently suggested: (1) tests of basic subject matter competence; e.g. mathematics; and (2) tests of skill in teaching. At least 15 states now require some form of teacher competency testing and six of those require the National Teachers Examination.

With respect to such tests, it does not seem to me unreasonable to expect new teachers to demonstrate mastery of the subject-matter they are expected to teach. In the past two years, two widely reported examinations of teachers in Texas caused great public concern.

Half of a sample of first-year teachers in Dallas failed a test of verbal ability, and half of Houston's teacher applicants scored lower than the average high school junior in mathematics.

I am not, however, convinced that we know what skills to look for in a prospective teacher, much less how to test for them.

Perhaps one of the most promising developments in pre-service education today is that teacher education institutions and schools both realize that they must do a better job in training teachers. We are, therefore, seeing more and more instances of school districts and schools of education cooperatively planning undergraduate courses of study including practical experience in classrooms, so that beginning teachers can be better prepared for the day-to-day problems they will experience as they began their careers.

Turning to the nearly two and one-half million teachers already in our classrooms, there is a great deal that can be done with inservice education.

I am well aware that many teachers look upon inservice programs with ill-disguised contempt. Such programs have been, frequently, served up with little sensitivity to what teachers needed, or to the real problems and issues facing them in their schools and classrooms.

Nevertheless, new possibilities for staff development have recently been opened up by a body of research published in the last year or two, and I want to take just a moment to explain its significance.

The research has been supported at NIE on the two general questions of "what makes an effective school?" and "what constitutes effective teaching?" The results of these two lines of inquiry run along similar lines and I want to concentrate on the characteristics of effective teaching. To summarize these findings, which may appear annoyingly self-evident, they are the following:

Keep the students engaged in academic tasks;

Use highly structured questions in order to elicit a relatively high rate of correct answers from students;

Provide immediate, academically oriented feedback to students, encouraging correct answers and exploring incorrect ones;

Accurately diagnose student skill levels, monitor student performance with frequent assessments, and individualize these assessments;

Expect that students will do well and let them know of those expectations.

I want to take just the first of those characteristics—keep the students engaged in academic tasks—because as obvious as it appears, we don't seem to be doing it very well in our schools.

We have been supporting a major multi-year study in California for the California Teacher Licensing Commission which began as an effort to identify desirable teacher characteristics so that the Commission, at whose request the study began, could look for those characteristics in new teachers.

It quickly became apparent that teacher behaviors in the classroom varied so widely that the search for desirable characteristics should be abandoned in favor of simply trying to describe what the typical teacher actually does.

A finding emerged which so surprises most teachers that they initially refuse to believe it: it is possible for one student to receive five times as much instruction as another in topics such as reading comprehension even though both are in the same school, at the same grade level, and supposedly, following the same curriculum.

How does this come about? First, only about 50 to 60 percent of the limited time available in a school day is devoted to academic subjects, reading, social studies, mathematics and science. The rest, in elementary schools, is devoted to music and art, storytelling, and sharing, along with lunch, recess, classroom changes and so on.

Of the time available for academic subjects, individual teachers vary enormously in the amount of that time actually engaged in academic work. Taking roll, moving from one activity in the same class to another, getting our books, preventing students from talking and day dreaming—all of these things eat into the few minutes available to the teacher. Good teachers keep students engaged; the less successful teachers are busy coping with disruptions.

This study found that some 5th grade students receive, over the course of an academic year, 5,000 minutes of instruction in reading comprehension, compared with other classes, supposedly following the same texts and curriculum, receiving less than 1,000.

The practical significance of this is that it is relatively straightforward to provide training so that teachers actually devote more time in the classroom to academic work than they had previously.

We have now in hand four studies which compared the achievement of students in two kinds of classes: (1) classes with teachers who received training in how to increase academic learning time; and (a) classes with teachers who did not receive the training.

In all four, teachers with the training increased the amount of engaged learning time for their students achievement increased.

In another staff development exercise, the Austin, Texas school district, knowing of the results of this academic time on task research, verified that the California experience was also true in Austin. After overcoming widespread disbelief on the part of the faculty regarding the accuracy of the findings, the District mounted a districtwide program to help schools and teachers increase the amount of time actually allocated for learning as well as the amount of engaged learning time.

Both the engaged learning time and student achievement increased. The Austin schools estimate they have added $4 million worth of instructional time for Austin's Title I children without spending one additional dollar or lengthening the school day.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me clear that teachers are now facing a more difficult assignment than at any time before in the history of our schools. And I think we are properly concerned about the quality of those planning on entering the teaching force.

But I also believe that the most important issue facing us today with respect to the teaching force is the question of improving and maintaining the skills of the millions of men and women already in our schools.

That may involve upgrading their skills in specific subjects such as science and mathematics which are changing rapidly.

It may also require specialized efforts to ensure that teachers are acquainted with new technologies which are likely to play a greater role in education in the years ahead. Quite evidently, they are destined to play a greater role in our society.

But I also like to think that organizations such as the National Institute of Education can play a significant role to encourage teachers to make the most of what they have in time and material for teaching.

For I am convinced that the time on task research, and the practical training activities which have been developed from it, have the potential to significantly increase the quality of education in our schools and ultimately the satisfaction teachers derive from their jobs as well as the respect they receive in the community.

I will be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. Simon. Thank you very much.

I am interested in the very last portion of your testimony as to what makes for effective teaching. What kind of attention has that received in education journals? How are we disseminating that information?

Mr. GOLDBERG. First let me say, we have a long way to go in disseminating research results. I think that happens to be a piece of work that has gotten pretty wide play.

The Austin experience has been discussed at conferences by the people in Austin themselves. NIE people have talked to teacher groups around the country, and I have used the opportunity whenever I can to talk to my peers. There are training materials that are now being made available to more and more people. So, I think that is a piece of work that is getting more play than others, However, there is still an enormous gap between what we know and what we do.

Mr. SIMON. At the top of page 11 you say, "I am not, however, convinced that we know what skills to look for in a prospective teacher, much less how to test for them."

You distinguish between the skill and how the teacher is now being tested.

Mr. GOLDBERG. That is right, I should clarify that.

I think a teacher who is going to be teaching mathematics ought to know mathematics. There are a number of ways in which we can test for those skills.

There are other skills that are much more complex and much more difficult to test for, that have to do with the way in which a teacher handles an emergency.

If I may give you an example, I was a teacher and a principal in the Philadelphia public schools. I recall studying for the principalship and then going in to take my oral examination.

The question I was asked by the district superintendent was: You are the principal of a school; the painters are painting the outside of your building; it is 2 minutes before dismissal time and someone comes in and tells you the roof painter fell off the roof. What would you do?

I racked my brain and realized this was something I had not been trained for.

When I asked why I was being asked the question, she said, because that happened yesterday in one of our schools, and the principal had to handle it.

There are crises every day in the lives of people who work in schools. How one deals with those crises with diversity, how one makes a parent understand pupil competency and all, are skills we have to test for.

Mr. SIMON. I thank you for an excellent statement.

Mr. Coleman.

Mr. COLEMAN. I too compliment you on your statement; it was very well presented.

My only concern is what concrete proposals can you give to this committee other than funding NIE? What can we do?

What can we do to stir support to do more than sit here and be frustrated?

Mr. GOLDBERG. First of all, I think holding this type hearing is terribly important. I think we need to have, if you will, national discussions on this issue. I think one of the things we did do is to encourage and perhaps even facilitate the convening of groups to talk about these issues. It is not uncommon, for example, for people within certain professional groups to talk about these issues. It is less common for people to talk about these issues across professional groups.

One of the things we can do is make those opportunities more possible.

I think we have to know much more than we presently know about how people are trying to solve these problems in the field. There are hundreds of colleges of education and more than 15,000 local school districts, some of whom have most exemplary inservice training programs. We have to do a more effective job of finding out what those are about.

Mr. COLEMAN. Is there any specific role for the Federal Government?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I believe that research which illuminates these issues is an appropriate, legitimate Federal role. I think we can bring the people together who are most concerned about these issues and who are perhaps not talking about them as much as we would like them to. We could convene these groups, encourage them with very, very limited resources, encourage them to use their larger resources, their facilities, to deal with these problems.

So, I believe research dissemination would be appropriate.

Mr. SIMON. We will hear from Mr. Daniel and the panel; we will hear testimony from all four.

Mr. Daniel, we understand we are hearing from a former teacher here. Do you want to tell us why you are a former teacher?

We have a rollcall on. Quickly, we will go over and vote, and then we will come right back.

[Recess.]

Mr. SIMON. The hearing will resume.

We will hear first from Mr. Daniel.

STATEMENT OF THURMOND DANIEL, FORMER TEACHER, ARLINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA, CURRENT EMPLOYEE OF PRIVATE CONSULTING AND COMPUTER FIRM, AND AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS PANEL

Mr. DANIEL. Good morning.

Mr. SIMON. Pleased to have you here with us. I understand you do not have a formal statement.

We would be interested in why you left the profession of teaching and what do we do—I guess, number 1, do we have a problem today, is it a growing problem, is it a diminishing problem, and what do we do about it?

Mr. DANIEL. My name is Thurmond Daniel. I taught in Arlington for 7 years. I did undergraduate work at Greensboro, and graduate work at the University of Virginia.

Originally, I was not looking for a job. I worked undergrad as a waiter. I made good money, good tips. So I was not looking for a job, especially not teaching. I happened to wait on the table of the assistant superintendent of Arlington County. He was on a recruiting trip, and I really got stuck to take that table because they came in right before the restaurant closed and I was the youngest waiter.

We ended up talking. He wanted to know where the universities were in Greensboro. I told him. He asked me what I intended to do after graduating. I had not thought about it. I did not need the money—I was doing fine.

He got in touch with my department chairman and he told me I should extend my appreciation and apply. Eventually, I taught junior and senior high. I applied for a teaching job and was told about my interest in sports, that I needed rapport with the youngsters—visibility in the community. However, you have to be in the county, pay your dues, get your track record established, et cetera, et cetera. I do not know how long that would have taken, something as subjective as that. That was a deterring factor. I decided things were not objective for advancement, things were very subjective, and unless you really could pinpoint exactly what the administration was looking for in a coach, or a person wishing to do something in extracurricular activities, there was no way I felt I could get a fair shot at expanding or changing my teaching career.

Teaching was fine, but when a counselor asked me to help him with the tennis team, and I related to him the same information, I said, "I don't know if you are aware, but the principal just told me a track record had to be made."

So I guess you could call it system burnout rather than job burnout.

I intend to go back sometime. I am currently working in private industry, at Sperry Rand at Merrifield, Va. For somebody going into teaching, I do not really know what would be the motivating factor that would make anyone want to choose the career.

I was in a lucky place. I had extremely visible people in our black neighborhood, who were going to make sure I was going to college. I had that type of role models. Today, I do not know. Youngsters get an impression about money. They are very financially oriented because the economic situation dictates that they have to help the family. In the section of Arlington I worked in, there was a high percentage of single-family homes. The majority of students were working because they had to work, and a high percentage of them were on various work study programs through the high schools.

So I gather for a person to go for an education career, they would have teachers they have picked out as role models, parents interested in them going into the education field or somebody visibly interested in them going into that field.

Today I think there are many lucrative fields and youngsters are pretty shrewd; they know the name of the game is finances. It will be hard when it comes to finance for them to choose a career in education.

Mr. **Simon**. Are you making more money now than you were teaching?

Mr. **Daniel**. Yes, but money was not the determining factor for me leaving. Money is nice, it is always nice, but that was not my sole purpose for leaving.

Mr. **Simon**. We thank you.

Mr. **Simon**. Myrna Cooper.

STATEMENT OF MYRNA COOPER, NEW YORK TEACHERS CENTER, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Ms. COOPER. I am representing the American Federation of Teachers today, with two of my colleagues. We are very pleased to be here and respond to the committee's interest in the condition of teacher education. The remarks we will make today, of which you have received summaries, are only preliminary. We expect to submit a more fully developed paper within the next 10 days.

We appreciate very much the opportunity to share your concerns and knowledge. They are real concerns.

We feel we have a different kind of pulse on the subject in that we continue to represent teachers long after colleges have lost touch with them and long after the certification process has taken place. We truly share the teachers' trials, tribulations, and risks as they move from neophytes to seasoned professionals.

I would like to introduce our panel. Ronald Spruill is a teacher who can describe transition from school to being a teacher, and some of the experiences which have been detrimental and those which have been worthwhile.

Paulette Bell has been a teacher in the District for 14 years; has currently left the school system and started her own Center for Ideal Education. She still remains in the education field, but is doing something else.

After that, I would like to share some of my experiences at the teacher center and give you some of the views and experiences of teachers currently on the job.

[The prepared statement of Myrna Cooper follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MYRNA COOPER, NEW YORK TEACHERS CENTER, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Much of what has been brought to this committee's attention has been statistical data having to do with the decline in the academic ability of the teaching force, labor market information on occupational retention and commentary on the general lack of program quality in teacher education programs. As an organization of teachers, A.F.T. both acknowledges and shares the concerns of the committee for it is our organization which continues to represent teachers' professional needs long after colleges have lost touch with them, faithfully shares teachers' trials and risks in the classroom and is resolute in its determination to recognize teachers' efforts and value as professionals.

It has always been a commitment of this organization to attempt to support the professional views of teachers by interfacing with agencies responsible for the education of teachers by advocating standards for entry into the profession and by promoting programs which provide incentives and conditions for inservice and staff development. Therefore, A.F.T. is pleased to respond to the committee's interest in the condition of teacher education. As a representative of teachers however, our views tend to translate into concrete expression of need, to promoting ideas which have been implemented to affect teaching and learning and to programmatic initiatives and recommendations that can make a difference to teachers and children in classrooms and schools.

CURRENT NEEDS

We are now in a period in which the reexamination of the professional development of teachers is more necessary than ever. We have identified several sets of circumstances which would appear to support this position. The first set of circumstances is tied to socio-economic conditions.

Decline in school enrollment causing shifts of teachers to unfamiliar areas of instruction;

Significantly higher average age of the teaching workforce increasing the time gap between what was the knowledge-base when most teachers were in pre-service and current ideas and practices;

Lengthening of the career span of teachers in response to diminished alternative opportunities thus increasing the desirability of renewal;

Changes in the environment of schooling and in the characteristics and values of society;

Rapid technological progress and accelerated information development; and

Alterations in demands placed on schools because of legal decisions.

The second strand is tied directly to educational developments:

Emphases have changed (back to basics, competency testing);

Pupil extremity is greater (truancy, alienation, students "at risk");

New strategies and materials have appeared (Mastery Learning, instructional technologies);

Curriculum has altered (environmental, career, moral, metric, global education);

Theories have expanded or altered (holistic teaching, learning disabilities, psycholinguistic analysis);

Legal mandates are present (sex-equity, bilingualism, mainstreaming); and

Research has accumulated (time on task, learning styles, teacher expectation studies).

Finally, there is a strand tied directly to teacher education itself; pre-service preparation has not yet dovetailed with the actual demands of teaching; colleges of education have expertise which needs to be linked to the classroom; and strong evidence exists that new entrants to teaching would be helped by a mechanism for facilitating internship or induction.

In sum, factors such as the decline of demand for new teachers and the consequent rise of the average age of teachers now in service, changing cultural and social patterns, the acceleration of knowledge accumulation, and the impact of technology have made the need for currency and renewal through inservice training opportunities very compelling. In addition, there seems to be a strong educational need to find better ways of assimilating teachers into the profession as well as closing the gap between the availability of knowledge and the delivery of instruction.

All of these relate to matters of considerable national concern. Therefore, the models of teacher education which we, as a nation, embrace and the incentives which we create to encourage teacher development should be consistent with the scope, scale, needs, priorities and technological sophistication of the society which teacher education seeks to serve.

The product under discussion here, the "machine of education" is the resource of human capital which is America's teachers. The question before us is how best to make that capital resource effective and current so that the investment already made is not wasted.

The recent New York Times "Survey of Continuing Education" has put several private sector practices before us which are worthy of consideration: Industry places high value on the support of an in-house staff development component, offers college courses on-site to its employees, devotes company time to training and upgrading of staff, exposes high level personnel with leadership potential to training and internship in diverse activities of the corporation, and in a great variety of ways, backed by massive investments of money, shows a recognition of the importance of continuing professional development of existing staff to the maintenance of a competitive edge in the marketplace.

(Ironically, last year's New York Times Continuing Education issue featured similar initiatives in teacher inservice education.) The foregoing private sector examples are only one side of the coin. The other side is the recognition that, in all respects, preeminence and success in the future requires investment, research and experimentation in the present and, interestingly, the Federal government in creating incentives for investment, research and experimentation (whatever the party of the administration) appears to agree.

The recommendations that we of A.F.T. and I as a staff developer and Director of the largest Teacher Center in the United States wish to put before you are consistent with what has just been described. We seek to encourage a Federal role in teacher education which stimulates professional development activities, increases the knowledge-base of teachers, insures the future relevance of teacher education to the needs of society, and provides incentives for teacher education activities.

Preservation of flagship programs such as Teacher Centers on the federal level will provide an effective mechanism for continuing on-the-job training. Teacher Centers have been a powerful on-the-job model for upgrading existing staff, working collaboratively with colleges and school districts, translating research into practice, and for assisting colleges in evaluating and reforming pre-service teacher education.

Encouraging internships for beginning teachers should be Federally supported to assure that those entering the profession will have the best chance of surviving. Research and experience indicate that the beginning year or two is the make or break period for teachers. A clinical support model similar to a medical internship permits practical and knowledge-based training on-the-job to take effect and strengthens the new teacher's skills and confidence and independence for future years.

Federal stimulus for reform in teacher education should reflect more than a concentration on a liberal education but should emphasize the scientific basis of the art of teaching and should, increasingly, specialize the practitioner. Teachers need specific clinical skills such as observation and analysis and interdisciplinary skills (psychological, sociological) which enable them to adapt and adjust subject matter to pupil and circumstance.

The Federal government is in a unique position to foster a collaborative and linkage effort on the part of institutional stakeholders in education without which reform and progress are unlikely. Motivating teachers, colleges of education, researchers, school districts and State Education Departments to serve the general need through collaborative programs such as teacher Centers can be accomplished by Federal incentives which make the interests of each the interests of each other.

Those who transmit knowledge cannot educate for the future in the context of the past. If teacher education staggers from neglect into obsolescence America's competitive edge will be lost. This is something that the private sector and the Federal government recognize whem it comes to lasers, genetic engineering and space exploration. We suggest that it is equally compelling with respect to teachers and their training.

STATEMENT OF RONALD SPRUILL, BALTIMORE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SPRUILL. Good morning. My name is Ronald Spruill, and I have been teaching for 6½ years in the Baltimore City public schools. My reason for speaking today is to share with you how college and the system have prepared me for my career in the classroom. During this time, I have learned much about classroom management, skill teaching, and recordkeeping, which are three vital tools of the classroom teacher.

I attended the University of Iowa where I was fortunate to receive training in special education and elementary education. My classes in special education afforded me the opportunity to share in experiences which allowed me to develop some of the skills of classroom management, starting in my sophomore year. I tutored groups of children enrolled in intermediate special education classes, developed roleplaying opportunities for children, and supervised children on the playground.

In my junior year, I was an assistant in a junior high school mathematics class. Naturally, in my senior year, I did my student teaching. I had two experiences, one in special education and one in elementary education. I was fortunate to do my student teaching in a black inner city Baltimore school. It was here under the tutorage of an outstanding teacher, Lois Washington, that the techniques of skill teaching and more management techniques were learned.

In my opinion, the weaknesses of my college program were: Lack of planning learning activities geared to objectives; lack of learning how to deal with reluctant parents; student teaching experience too short; and recordkeeping and evaluation of records inadequately prepared.

In my opening statement, I mentioned three tools of an effective teacher. I consider one of the most important skills of a teacher to be classroom management. If a teacher cannot manage his classroom, then learning is at a minimum. Very little training is offered on how to effectively manage the many elements which influence the classroom environment.

There are everyday situations which need to be addressed—discipline, overcrowding, and intruders, to name a few.

Unfortunately, most colleges do not address these problems in their teaching training program.

The most consistent problem I have noticed from beginning teachers is the lack of proper skill development, classroom management, and recordkeeping.

If a teacher does not keep accurate records, he will not be able to determine what an individual has mastered or what skills he needs. Hopefully, recordkeeping is now being taught in workshops where beginning teachers can be given preference.

A reason for my missing some of these tools in my beginning years could be that I have not been an outstanding student, but why are there so many beginning teachers who started out as I? The problem is not only in the colleges or the system, but in a society so full of complications.

How does a college or a system prepare a teacher for a news media that does not understand the concept of standard English? Television reporters, magazine editors, and newspaper editors seem to have forgotten that a sentence should express a complete thought.

How do they prepare us to ignore shirts which read, "Those who can do, those who can't teach"?

How do we fight commercials and shows which feel, "There ain't no reason" to help us in our fight to show children the reasons for doing things properly?

How can we learn to understand why citizens and politicians still do not trust the schools even though standardized test scores have raised dramatically in Baltimore over the past 5 years.

How could they have trained me to accept after only 6½ years of elementary school teaching with six different principals and five different senior teachers, the fact that I have at least three former students incarcerated for murder? How will the courts explain releasing them in a few years? When will the public stop blaming us for everything which is wrong in our schools? When will we be paid a salary at least equal to bus drivers?

I have been trained by many people who tried their best. I am truly appreciative of their efforts; but if changes are not made soon, many dynamic classroom careers will come to an end.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF PAULETTE BELL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Ms. BELL. I am speaking on teacher retention. I have given you only a brief summary of what I have to say.

I do not want to leave education, I do not want to leave the classroom, but eventually for my own mental health, unless things change, I will have to. These sentiments were expressed by a woman or a man, unidentified teacher, who spoke to Ramsay O. Meade, author of an article called "Teachers Tell Why Are We Miserable." They are the sentiments of a surprising number of good teachers, teachers leaving the system in greater numbers than ever before.

Why? Why are good teachers leaving the system? The answers are multiple and complex. I will focus on one which seems to occur often, teacher stress and burnout. The phenomenon of teacher stress has reached an epidemic proportion and has received a great deal of publicity in the last few years. A survey conducted by Learning magazine revealed that 93 percent of 1,282 teachers who responded had experienced some symptoms of burnout, and that only 63 percent of those affected have found some acceptable means of coping. Burnout is described by psychologist Ava Pines as a physical, emotional, and attitudinal exhaustion. The symptoms include being tired all the time, sleeplessness, and depression. Burnout is the result of unchecked stress caused by the institution's constant and unyielding demands and the environment of teaching.

People ask me why I left the system specifically and they want to know, were you burned out? When I left the system, that was not the case, but I certainly did experience burnout. I experienced burnout after about 6 or 7 years of teaching. The result of that was that I decided I had to have sabbatical leave. I took sabbatical leave that year and discovered not only a way of enhancing, making myself more creative as a teacher, but I also discovered some very good techniques for handling and dealing with burnout, and stress management.

I became at that time very much interested in how to help other teachers who had gotten to the point I had gotten to. When I got back to the school system, I was a new teacher, a different teacher. It turned out I got into a situation everybody else would consider ideal. I was teaching at Duke Ellington School of the Arts; small classes, motivated students, committed administration. So why did I leave the system? I left the system because even with this, I was not able to achieve my goal, which is ideal education, that is to assure that each and every child reaches actual potential, that every child who comes to me leaves closer to the goal of ideal education. If this was an ideal situation, why could we not achieve that goal? I think one of the major factors reflecting that is what Ron mentioned, that is, the whole attitude of our country toward education. We think that school is the worst thing that can happen to a child. We joke about how poor kids that have to go back to school. There is a lot of lip talk given to education, but very little commitment.

I think many of us realize and feel the way I feel about education and teaching; teaching is the most noble profession in the world. No matter what I do, I will always be attached to the process of education, the process of sharing knowledge, the process of learning and also giving.

But most think of it as glorified babysitting. They are not concerned whether or not children are learning but whether or not they are kept off the streets.

That was probably the major reason why I left the system, so I could create a situation which was an ideal education.

What would an ideal system have that the system did not have here? One of the main things would be motivated students, motivated parents, motivated teachers. At this point, when students come into the classroom, we almost have to spoonfeed them, we almost have to entertain them to get them to learn.

When will we discover that without learning, there is no life? That is the ideal educational situation that I am looking for.

[The prepared statement of Paulette Bell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PAULETTE BELL, FORMER TEACHER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR IDEAL EDUCATION

TEACHER RETENTION

Teachers are leaving the classroom in greater numbers than ever before. One major cause is stress and burnout. Ninety-three percent of teachers in a survey conducted by Learning Magazine had experienced symptoms of burnout. Only about two-thirds of those had discovered acceptable means of coping.

Burnout is physical, emotional and attitudinal exhaustion. Its major cause is frustration. Teachers leaving the system are seeking relief from this physical and emotional drain.

In Chicago, Illinois, teachers rated the three most stressful school situations as involuntary transfers, disruptive students and the threat of personal injury. These stressors, like other identified areas of concern—no control over job environment and little opportunity for decision-making—are significant because they contribute to the frustration that prevent teachers from realizing the goal of education, that of helping each student reach his/her potential.

Good teachers are leaving the system because they are burned out—a state arising from the frustration of being unable to realize their goals.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, AFL-CIO

The American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, is a union of over 580,000 members, of whom the majority are teachers and teacher educators. For some time, concerns about teacher education and teacher retention have been raised separately and collectively by these constituent groups. We are pleased, therefore, to have the opportunity to offer some insights and recommendations on federal involvement in these areas.

It would be unfair not to recognize at the outset that, over their relatively short history, teacher preparation programs have made tremendous strides. Fifty years ago, about 55 percent of the teaching force did not have the equivalent of two years of training beyond high school (Evenden, 1935). Normal schools' evolution into teacher colleges significantly changed teacher preparation. A two- to three-year curriculum was extended to four years; subjects studied extended far beyond what was to be taught; a general or liberal arts education was added to professional training; requirements in the major field were increased; professional studies in history and foundations of education and curriculum and teaching methods were broadened and various forms of practical experience, ending with student teaching were established (Edelfelt and Johnson). Much of this transition was still taking place from the 1940s through the 1960s.

Due to a number of complex factors, this evolutionary process seems to have gotten bogged down in the last 20 years. There is now general consensus that teacher education, whether at the preservice or inservice level, is not what it should or could be. Individuals, task forces and commissions have studied the problem, but as Kevin Ryan of Ohio State University points out, "while all these studies give teacher education a negative evaluation, they rarely identify the same problems and even more rarely recommend the same action." If the problem were a simple one—that teacher educators, for example, just were not doing what we knew they ought to be—it could be easily remediated. But these same teacher educators have addressed themselves to reform, only to find many of the issues outside their control. The elements of accreditation; the overall teacher education program, including admissions, content, practicum, internships, and graduate programs; certification; licensing; and professional development are varied and complex. Influences of uncohesive interest groups and dichotomous financial and political considerations are tearing the system apart. Because it seems to be floundering, federal leadership is very much needed. We would, in fact, like to see the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education make these hearings only the first step in a national forum on teacher education and retention wherein all concerned parties are involved in ongoing discussions on needed reforms. The timing is right because we now have much of the professional knowledge base necessary to construct valid criteria and standards for teacher education. Because there is no mechanism to bring teachers, teacher educators, state and federal government representatives and the public together, wars rage on paper and in organizational meetings, but little is resolved.

THE NEED FOR A COMPETENT TEACHING FORCE

With many national priorities before us, how important is teacher education and the quality of our teaching force? The AFT believes these matters go far beyond being a self-interest issue for the profession. Arguing the point that education is the backbone of democracy should be unnecessary at this point in time. History clearly shows that an illiterate society cannot know its rights, let alone protect them. Most people would take for granted that both our economy and society as a whole depend upon a literate and productive populace.

We have reached a point in the development of our educational system, however, when we must guard against falling victim to the old saying, "Familiarity breeds contempt." The six-volume International Education Studies and innumerable others have shown the United States to offer more educational opportunities of better cumulative quality to more people than any other nation in the world. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, almost 100 percent of children 6- to 14-years-old are participating in education; by age 16, it is still about 94 percent and at age 17, almost 85 percent. At least one-third of our 19- to 21-year-olds are engaged in formal training. Interestingly, our most dramatic improvements in enrollments have been made in the last 40 years—corresponding to the time the federal government has played an active role in education. Too often we brush aside these gains and accomplishments as we highlight our problems. As proof, you will see the following trends widespread:

Frequent media attacks on the quality of education (headlines are usually much more condemnatory than the content);

A realtively well-educated adult population which questions the knowledge base of teaching as a profession;

Business and industry establishing their own training programs, from basic skills to liberal arts; and

Proposals to "deschool" society or dismantle public education through vouchers or tuition tax credits.

Credit must be given to our public schools and our colleges and universities for educating people to the point where they expect and demand more. Raised expectations are a sign that our educational system, in general terms, is very healthy. But we stand at a critical juncture in the development of this system. Rather than focusing on how to make a good system even better, we could choose to turn our backs on public education. Continuing to berate the system without taking any thoughtful action to improve it will lead to its crumbling from inside from sheer neglect. Another approach is to actively dismantle it, parceling out the pieces to a fragmented group of special interests. In this case, it should be noted that education would necessarily serve parochial and profit-making interests, not society as a whole.

Because the welfare and security of this nation are at stake, we believe the federal government has an obligation to see that the institution of public education is not weakened or destroyed, whether through neglect or purposeful intent. Federal leadership helped the states successfully address the quantity issue of mass education. Education is now at a crossroads—a natural second stage in its evolution—the point at which we make assurances that quality accompanies quantity. No more than cultures could develop before pioneers did the crude work of clearing land and building homesteads should we expect our public education system to run ahead of society. But we all have a stake in making the investment in time, effort and money to keep it apace with our societal needs. Just as the current technological knowledge base developed from diverse, and even unexpected, sources, establishment of our educational knowledge base needs the same opportunity to progress with input from all sectors of the profession, as well as the community it serves. As already stated, only the federal government has the power to support and coordinate such efforts.

We have prefaced our remarks on teacher education with this general overview of the importance, function and progress of public education with reason. Immediate economic, sociological and political concerns have placed this developmental process (of which teacher education is one part) in jeopardy. The schools, for example, were expected to improve the economy and economic opportunity by producing a skilled and literate workforce while at the same time a lagging economy pared school budgets to the bare bones level. Programmatic decision-making at all levels of education now, more often than not, is based on economic rather than educational concerns. Schools given innumerable tasks related to the improvement of society could not singularly accomplish them all and thus became the scapegoats for the wide range of problems they failed to solve. Diane Ravitch, writing in the American Scholar, states:

"Nearly all the educational controversies of the 1970s—whether over bilingualism or sex education or testing or open admissions or bussing—dealt with some aspect of the educational process that was of great importance to some constituency, but none directly raised these questions: What does it mean to be an educated person? What knowledge is of most worth? Are the graduates of our schools educated people?"

She goes on to say that educational policy-makers have fallen into the habit of assessing school issues almost entirely in sociological and economic terms, without regard to the content of the educational program.

We suggest that Ms. Ravitch has raised very important questions, which, if they continue to be ignored, will affect the very underpinnings of our society. Consider the following statistics on 1980 high school graduates; 8 percent had taken calculus; 26 percent had taken trigonometry; 37 percent had taken chemistry; and 19 percent had taken physics.

These statistics reflect a continuing trend which began with significant drops in the number of U.S. degrees earned between 1970–71 and 1978–79 in mathematics, physical sciences and engineering. In Japan, 39 percent of the high school population goes on to college compared to roughly 25 percent in the U.S. College preparatory programs in Japan, however, include physics, biology, chemistry and earth sciences. Most Japanese students take math courses each year, going beyond the trigonometry level. (A national teacher center system keeps science and math teachers up-to-date in knowledge and skills.) In the Soviet Union, similar emphasis is placed on math and science. Implications for this nation's ability to compete in the technological marketplace, space and defense should be self-evident.

The confusion attending the questions of what constitutes a well-educated person, what knowledge is of most worth and whether our schools' graduates are well-educated has made its weight felt no less in our teacher education programs. Mandates from state and federal levels designating ever broader priorities and additions to teacher preparation wreak havoc on the curricula, staffing and time allocations within schools of education. Until there is some basic agreement on the purpose of elementary and secondary education, a purpose the schools are capable of serving, it will be difficult to determine the purpose and direction of teacher education. This, however, is one issue among many.

ACCREDITATION

Obviously, teacher education will be no better than the content and continuity of its programs. Close to 1,400 institutions—70 percent of all colleges and universities—offer teacher education programs.

Accreditation is meant to be the evaluation process by which "a school or one of its programs is recognized as having met certain criteria (measures of value: What is to assessed?) and standards (level of attainment within each criterion: To what extent?)." (Koff and Florio) Addressing accreditation with respect to teacher preparation is complicated by the fact that at least two separate accrediting bodies or processes are involved. Prospective elementary teachers take approximately 60 percent of their coursework outside the professional school; secondary level candidates almost 70 percent. Programs and courses in these liberal arts areas are evaluated by one of six regional accrediting agencies. The much smaller block of time spent in professional training is approved or accredited by the state and sometimes by independent bodies.

Generally, there is little disagreement that our total postsecondary accreditation system is both ineffective and inefficient. To begin with, few regulations govern the initial establishment of a college or university. This, in itself, can lead to a proliferation of "diploma mills," a matter of increasing concern. The policy reflects a national tradition, however, of keeping higher education free from political interference. Tradition not withstanding, the debate continues over who can be trusted with accreditation. Government, whether at the state or federal level, is said to be unsuited for this responsibility because it is too easily influenced by political considerations. Having federal funding tied to accreditation, as is now the case, is, according to some, government intrusion in the rights of postsecondary institutions and a threat to academic freedom, not to mention states' rights. Educators and institutions likewise have been tainted with the charge of self-interest. It is probably true that the federal government has no direct role to play in accreditation, but again leadership is needed to focus discussion on the basic questions, who can assure the public that an accredited school or program truly represents quality and what do we mean by quality?

Six regional accrediting institutions now handle overall accreditation of the nation's colleges and universities. They are financed and operated as non-governmental, voluntary bodies by the institutions they accredit. Evaluations are based on self-study reports done over a year's time by committees throughout the college or university. These internal reports precede the visit by the accreditation team and are often cited as being a tremendous fiscal and time drain from school programs. Growing dissatisfaction with the validity of the regional bodies' assessments is evidenced by the fact that from 1977 to 1979, 18 states passed legislation increasing their authority over the operation of postsecondary institutions or the right to confer degrees. As reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education, state officials express increasing concern that regional accreditors are failing to distinguish between weak and strong institutions; neglecting out-of-state programs in home-campus studies; and withholding information the state needs in decision-making on which institutions deserve financial support. Regional agencies, it is claimed, are afraid that disapproving marginal institutions could prevent them from receiving funds necessary for their survival.

It is not clear, therefore, that even accredited courses taken by potential teachers outside their professional training—which it should be remembered, is the majority of their undergraduate work—meet minimum standards. Little, if any, of this work is related to education, and the low prestige which teacher education currently enjoys allows few opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching between the liberal arts and education faculties. Here again is a situation over which teacher educators have no control.

A corollary to this problem is that poor coordination and planning between these two schools serves to further weaken the teacher education program. As an example, a secondary teacher candidate pursuing her own interests in her major field selects most courses in English literature and medieval poetry. Aware, as a student, of education's status problem, she conceals the fact she is an education major in these courses for fear her work will not be taken seriously. Upon graduation, her teaching assignment is seventh grade English. Added to all the normal insecurities of beginning teaching is uneasiness over the question of appropriate subject matter for 12- and 13-year-olds in seventh grade English classes. Many new teachers have experienced the discomfort of wondering how well their training matches the subject or grade level they have been assigned and they adapt. But the question must still be raised as to whether better planning within teacher education could better prepare teachers for assignments at all levels of their certification.

Returning to accreditation in liberal arts areas, it must be noted that state assumption of accreditation would not be without its problems. In many instances their track record has been worse than that of the independent accrediting associations. Can state agencies, afterall, reduce funds or close down in-state institutions for failure to meet standards, given the political outcry sure to follow from the state legislature, as well as the public? Could incumbent political parties refrain from interfering with academic freedom and the curriculum, if given control over accreditation?

No less problemmatic is teacher education accreditation. Most states now use the program approval approach by which they evaluate a school's course offerings and then rely on the school to see that students have acquired the skills necessary for effective teaching. State approval is mandatory, and the empowered state agency may refuse certification to graduates of unapproved programs.

National accreditation of teacher education is given on a voluntary basis through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Only 540 schools of the approximate 1,400 schools of education participate in this national accrediting process. NCATE is controlled by the National Education Association and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, although the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National School Boards Association and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education also have seats on the Council. NCATE's recent self-study conducted by the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University was highly critical of the accrediting agency. Revised standards adopted in January, 1979 were found to be so vague as to "impede attempts to judge program quality." Some NCATE teams failed to "apply many requirements in the standards" and team members were found to make "inconsistent" evaluations and "quantitative rather than qualitative judgments." In addition to noting "inappropriate institutional influence over the composition of evaluation teams" and over "future participation of team members" in evaluations, the study concluded that NCATE "contributes to the low quality of teacher training programs by providing superficial stamps of approval to weak programs."

It is hardly surprising that neither the public nor the profession puts much faith in our present accrediting processes. Problems of governance and control raise real concerns. We can seriously ask why teacher educators and close to half a million teachers in the country are not represented in our professional accreditation. But as Robert Koff and David Florio have pointed out, there are even more "fundamental questions of purpose. For example, is there a distinct purpose for a national body to accredit teacher education separate from institutional accrediting and state program approval systems? If so, what criteria and standards are appropriate for distinguishing schools and general program areas that are accreditable from those that are not?"

Federal leadership could provide the stimulus for a rigorous dialog on the many issues related to post-secondary accreditation. Groups such as the major teacher organizations, faculty and deans of education schools, state and federal government representatives, and the Education Commission of the States should be involved in planning a forum for this discussion.

In 1976, AACTE sponsored a study by a group called the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching (CEPT). Recommendations made by this body provide a partial basis for discussion.

1. Accreditation should remain nongovernmental in nature.
2. "The profession" needs to be redefined to include college-based teacher educators as legitimate members and appropriate representatives.
3. The expanding responsibility of accrediting agencies to the public requires public representation on the governing councils of accreditation agencies.
4. Accreditation procedures should provide full disclosure to the public.
5. Accreditation processes must be specific, detailed, and current to insure quality, but not so complex that they will drain off resources from the preparation programs.
6. Accreditation processes must become less campus oriented, and less fragmented by traditional degree distinctions.
7. Accreditation processes must place major emphasis upon the products of training programs.

While the AFT does not necessarily endorse this position, we do feel the issues need to be addressed.

THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

A. Admissions.—Teaching formerly attracted many high-ranking high school graduates. This was true particularly of women, to whom few professions were open. When career opportunities in business, law, medicine and other professions expanded as a result of the feminist and civil rights movements, schools of education experienced sharp declines in enrollments among women and minorities. Recent studies indicate the majority of students now enrolling in teacher education are from the bottom third of their graduating high school class. Additionally, media reports of teaching applicants found unable to read, write or compute effectively are increasing. Minimal salaries, low prestige and poor working conditions are likely causes of education's failure to continue to attract our brightest students to the profession.

Facing declining enrollments and widespread RIFing and program cutbacks, admissions policies in teacher education—lax to begin with—have become even more lenient. We believe this practice further undermines the profession and the role education should be expected to perform in society. Just as ATF supports testing as one criteria to be judged in entrance to the profession, we feel standards for entrance to teacher preparation should be developed and enforced. Standards for admission should be included in the dialog on teacher education already proposed.

The AFT, however, opposes the National Education Association's proposal that quotas be set on admissions. Demographic projections indicate that additional teachers are likely to be needed from the mid-1980s on. The argument that many teachers currently unable to find jobs will be available to fill these positions is not borne out by past experience. RIFed teachers who have found employment outside education and are then given the opportunity to return to their teaching position, rarely opt to come back. Rather than closing the profession to candidates who meet its standards, it makes more sense to counsel them on realistic job market prospects and equip them with skills adaptable to various education-related services, whether in the schools, business or the community. More study is needed on the latter to determine where this can be accomplished within the regular professional program or must be an offshoot of it.

B. Content.—The problem of sufficient time to insure teachers receive adequate training in both liberal arts and pedogogy plagues all countries. Britain, for example, has changed emphasis from one to the other, just as the United States has. Four years is simply insufficient to provide the knowledge and experiences candidates for teacher certification ideally should have. Beyond mastery of basic skills, teachers should study the arts, humanities and natural and social scienes. Currently, such training is often incomplete, fragmented and unrelated to any educational implications. Teachers must study the individual through such social sciences as psychology, the individual in groups through sociology, and the cultures and behavior of individuals within them through anthropology. Additionally, indepth knowledge of subject matter, particularly for secondary teachers, should be required. Even though it is sometimes questionable whether all this has been accomplished with graduates of four-year liberal arts programs, the prospective teacher still needs professional or pedagogical training. This includes a wide range of knowledge and skills, among them the history and philosophies of education; developmental psychology; diagnostic, planning and prescriptive techniques; instructional methods; classroom management strategies; research capabilities; curriculum; evaluation; special population needs; practicum; and much more. Proficiency in many of these areas requires more than one three- to five-hour course. Normally, all this must be accomplished during the third and fourth year of undergraduate training, while coursework is subjects outside the professional school continues.

Some educators suggest that a fifth or sixth year be added to teacher preparation. While this would resolve the time issue, we believe it is unlikely that many students would put this investment into their education without much higher economic rewards than teaching currently offers. Internships, which will be discussed later, seem a more realistic alternative at the present time.

Content of the teacher education program, in terms of liberal arts and pedogogy, presents another issue for the national discussion we have proposed. In addition to the scope this study should entail, several specific questions need examination.

First, we now have a growing body of research available on effective teaching practices, grouping, classroom management, teacher expectations, learning styles and the like. In effect, there finally exists the foundation for a validated science of teaching. Yet, the majority of teachers and teacher educators are not trained in how to conduct research or interpret and apply its results. Far too much of the "technology of teaching" sits on shelves in libraries and research institutions. Teachers and teacher educators, we believe, should have some knowledge of how to apply research techniques in pursuing learning problems, the opportunity to apply these skills at the preservice and inservice levels, and access to a dissemination mechanism which keeps them up-to-date on the latest educational research findings. Assurances should also exist that these findings are incorporated in teacher education courses.

Second, special attention needs to be given to the inadequate financing of teacher preparation programs. Figures from a 1980 study by Peseau and Orr speak for themselves. While the averge amount spent on a third-grade student is $1,400, the average amount for training a teacher is $927. Within the total university, however, the equivalent full-time student expenditure averages $2,363. Generally, schools of education are alloted only slightly over a quarter of the revenue they produce.

Third, serious thought needs to be given to comparisons of training systems employed in the various professions and what, if any, lessons for education can be drawn from the medical, legal and engineering fields. Dreeban, for example, notes the "medical students, because of their proximity to research and its infusion into their training, tend to become consumers of and participants in it." He also points out that the need to master formidable amounts of material and complete time-consuming projects in the medical, legal and architecture professions forces students to work out a collective solution to the workload problem. By sharing information with each other, they actually teach one another. Because pressures in schools of education are not as great, the isolation and independence of the classroom teacher is bred at the preservice level.

Fourth, a system for integrating liberal arts and professional training in a much more meaningful way within teacher education is needed. A crucial question relevant to this issue is whether teaching can achieve true professional status with so little control over large segments of the curriculum.

Finally, planning participatory mechanisms for evaluation and integration of new priority areas in the teacher education curriculum should be developed. To maintain continuity and stability in the training program, concerns such as adequate funding, availability of personnel and time constraints should be reviewed prior to new requirements being mandated. Too frequently we have used the "sardine can approach" to the education curriculum.

C. Practicum.—Technically, the topic of school-related experience comes under content, but the issue merits discussion in its own right.

One of the most prevalent criticisms of teacher education is the minimal teaching and field experience students receive prior to teaching. Suggestions for uniting theory and practice abound in the literature. Problems, however, accompany each solution.

Most agree that experiences with teaching should begin as soon as a student enters the teacher preparation program. A great deal of administrative planning is required, however, to arrange student and faculty schedules to accommodate field observation and experience. Additionally, student transportation costs can be quite high. (Programs oriented toward exposing students to a variety of career choices in education-related fields experience even greater time and resource problems.) Several studies indicate that many skills can be taught as well through protocal materials, microteaching, simulation, modeling and demonstration as in classroom experimental teaching. Further exploration should take place on what type of balance between simulated and actual teaching proves most effective.

More data is also needed on appropriate procedures for selection of cooperating teachers; mechanisms for involving school-based personnel, such as linkages with teacher centers; and techniques for evaluation of field-based activities. As the Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching (CEPT) cautions, field experience in itself is no magic answer. Its usefulness depends on the variety and depth of experience offered, the abilities of school and college-based supervisors, and opportunities for feedback and growth.

Although much greater collaboration is warranted between schools of education and the elementary and secondary schools, overall university procedures inhibit this. Research and publication are the main criteria by which faculty members within higher education are judged; yet field supervision can take a great amount of time. CEPT advises that teacher educators must function in the research-oriented world of higher education and keep close ties to the real world of classrooms and schools. Further study is needed to determine whether both of these priorities can be accommodated by teacher education faculty or whether specialization, with full recognition given to field-oriented work, is required.

D. Internships.—At the 1975 AFT Convention, delegates passed a resolution calling for two- to three-year teacher internships. In the future, no new teachers, it said, should be certified until a program of internship has been completed. During this time, interns should have responsibility for less than a full teaching load and be paid a negotiated base salary. The additional time during the school day would include work with experienced teachers who could demonstrate various teaching techniques and curricular approaches; observation throughout K-12 to provide an awareness of continuity within education; work with other education personnel, such as counselors and social workers; participation in curriculum development; pursuit of research projects; and familiarization with the purpose and functions of various divisions of the school structure. An essential aspect of the internship must be frequent consultation with and feedback from participating teacher education faculty members and cooperating classroom teachers. A supportive environment for ongoing inservice training and professional development must be provided to allow interns to reach their full potential in linking theory to practice.

While Florida, Nevada, and Vermont recommend a fifth-year internship for teachers, Oklahoma probably could be said to have taken the greatest strides in this area. Through passage of Bill 1706 in June 1980, the legislature made sweeping changes in the state's teacher education program. Its provisions include: (a) increasing the standards of admission into colleges of education; (b) more clinical field work in the preparation process; (c) competency examinations in subject areas before graduation; (d) an entry year internship before certification; (e) the monitoring of the first-year teacher's performance by a team representative of the profession; and (f) provisions for the continuing education of teachers and teacher educators. (Wisniewski) During the one-year internship following graduation, the intern will be assisted by a three-person committee composed of a consulting teacher, the school principal and a teacher education professor. In addition to assisting the intern, this committee then recommends at the end of the year whether or not the intern should be certified.

This model and others in development, or proposed, should be studied to determine their strenghts and weaknesses. Cost projections are also needed by states considering internships. Procedures for shared fiscal responsibilities among local school systems, schools of education and the state need to be explored and defined. AFT policy calls for lightened teaching loads for interns to allow for a wide range of growth experiences. Although this is fairly simple at the secondary level, further thought must be given to possible team teaching approaches at the elementary level to prevent disruption or discontinuity in students' learning. No less important is further review of the qualifications and training needs of college and K-12 internship supervisors. By making research on internship models a priority, the federal government would not only encourage states to upgrade professional preparation of teachers but also help them avoid many potential pitfalls.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION AND LICENSURE

By 1967 all states had assumed responsibility for teacher certification from local and county govenments. State certification is based on possession of a bachelor's degree and successful completion of a program or specified courses in an approved institution. Professions clearly recognized as such have responsibility for governing themselves, with the appropriate authority being delegated by the state. This includes preparation, licensure and monitoring of ethics and competence of its members. To date, only two states—Oregon and California—have professional practices commissions for education with their own legal power. At least 19 additional states have created standards and licensure or standards and practices commissions advisory to state boards of education.

Because the scope, functions and composition of these bodies vary so widely and because an increasing number of states are involved in revamping certification or licensure procedures, the AFT encourages the federal government to support a study of the various models, with emphasis on the strengths and weaknesses of each in fulfilling its mission to upgrade teacher education and improve the profession.

The AFT also supports much greater involvement of teachers and teacher educators in setting and maintaining standards for the profession. Standards relevent to admissions and the content of teacher education have already been discussed. In addition, AFT advocates use of a written examination which tests the level of literacy, knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy to qualify entrants to the profession, as part of a licensure process which includes completion of a full teacher education degree program. Such basic competency tests should be developed or adopted with participation of teachers through their union and should be preliminary to acceptance in a teacher internship program, whereby successful completion results in permanent certification or licensure.

As more and more states move to teacher competency testing, the federal government should increase its funding of research related to the types of competencies being assessed, the job-relatedness of the tests to teaching, and current testing limitations. Monies for further test development and validation are also needed, but teacher unions should be involved in this process.

To clarify our position, it should be noted that while we find entrance examinations suitable for use as one criterion in judgments on entrance to the profession and even in local hiring, we would strongly object to their use in decisions related to teacher retention, salary promotion or tenure. First, repeated testing of two million, or even one thousand, teachers is much more expensive than implementation of a good inservice and professional development program and evaluation system which will either improve or weed out the extremely small percentage of incompetent teachers. Moreover, it is unfair to have certified a teacher on one set of standards and come back 10, 20 or 30 years later and tell them they are unemployed because somebody changed their mind. Consider the political ramifications if any certification or licensing board could, upon the whim of those controlling it, totally change the rules of the game. The constant job insecurity and consequent demoralization would make teaching impossible and turn prospective candidates away from the profession.

Certification or licensure, in sum, should be subject to rigidly enforced standards which include successful completion of a rigorous, thorough and well-integrated teacher education program; a written examination graranteeing minimally acceptable achievement levels in literacy, subject matter knowledge and pedagogy; and a carefully planned and supervised internship program.

INSERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Much has already been said about the time constraints of teacher preparation programs. Even if post-graduate internships were in place, teachers would still need to fill in gaps in subject matter, liberal arts areas, instructional and classroom management skills, technological advancements, and research application. Yet, even though teacher education today is far from being as thorough as it might be, school-sponsored inservice training and professional development have reached the point of being almost non-existent. Traditionally, neither schools nor state governments have invested any significant sums in inservice education. (The cost of meeting an overwhelming number of service and program requirements has taken priority.) Funds have been even further reduced in the widespread and drastic budget cuts of the last several years. The majority of school systems offer only one, two or three inservice days during the year. This still leaves 177 to 179 days of the average school year that teachers have no access to professional growth opportunities or to help with problems, other than what they can arrange on their own. Furthermore, no mechanisms exist to reward teachers for academic achievements or to motivate them to expand their intellectual and professional horizons. Signals from every level indicate that economics, not education, is the true concern of the system.

With fewer beginning teachers coming into the schools, the stable teaching force has been cut off from a major source of new ideas. Without the activity naturally generated in the presence of ideas, it is easy to fall into dull, mechanistic routines. What, it must be asked, do schools do to promote the excitement of learning among faculty and students?

Although the federal government has provided more stimulus for inservice training than anyone else, it, with two major exceptions, has not addressed the professional development problem as a whole. Inservice programs in specific areas and programs with specific inservice components have been funded, but none of these were ever coordinated. A large number of federally-funded inservice programs support projects that have as their purpose the development of training materials for trainers of trainers. Ironically, because the state and school system don't have the money to fund the trainers, many of these materials never get used.

Major federal successes include much of the Teacher Corps program and many teacher centers. It is discouraging to see the investments made in both these programs dropped for what seemingly are purely political reasons.

Consider teacher centers, for example. A significant number of federally-funded centers developed collaborative mechanisms which for the first time allowed education school faculty, teachers, administrators and parents to work together and share information on a collegial basis. Century-old barriers slowly are being torn down. A review of the literature over the last three years on inservice education reveals praise of teacher centers' accomplishments from all segments of the educational community.

It would be unthinkable that after a federal investment of close to $50 million in the last four years, the concept died because one person, who admittedly had never visited a teacher center, charged them with being "union hiring halls." The fact is they are not, and the concept, which originated in Britain and Japan, works.

Several teacher centers funded in FY '79 and FY '80 could serve as models for the nation. We suggest that using these centers' documentation data, research be conducted to determine exactly what the centers have accomplisahed. We have found that these federally-funded centers can show not only dramatic changes in veteran teachers' instructional methods, but also contributions to student achievement gains and increased parental involvement in the schools. They have also visibly improved teacher morale in sites they serve. We reiterate that much of this documentation exists; it need only be validated.

Similarly, given the substantial funding appropriated to Teacher Corp over the years and the many lessons learned about the training of teachers, it seems it would be a tremendous waste not to indentify and disseminate its successful practices.

Basically, if teachers are not to fall victim to stress and burnout, if we are to keep our best teachers from leaving the profession, teachers must be confident that they truly possess a professional knowledge base and be given the opportunity to work in an intellectually stimulating environment.

We hope the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education will consider establishing the national dialog on teacher education suggested. We do not believe extended hearings can produce the substantive results that a broad-based, structured forum for discussion would. There is an urgent need for a give and take among various groups of educators, government officials and the public, if standards are to be improved and maintained in our educational system.

Finally, we encourage increased support of the National Institute of Education to continue research in the areas recommended, to further develop the science of teaching and to improve dissemination of research results.

Ms. COOPER. As a teacher center director, I would like to talk a little bit about the immediate needs of teachers currently on the job, which I suspect could be classified as postsecondary education, how we think they should be dealt with educationally, present a rationale for continued Federal involvement, and close with some recommendations which the subcommittee might consider.

We are now in a period in which the reexamination of the professional development of teachers is more necessary than ever. We have identified several sets of circumstances which would appear to support this position. The first set of circumstances is tied to socioeconomic conditions.

Many of us have been with the system 17 to 20 years, the span of the knowledge created since our entry into the profession, and where we now continue to grow, and there does not happen to be at this time a systemwide approach to filling that gap. The rapid technological progress which has occurred in this country, computer, video, elements which students deal with every day, which for most of us a generation or two beyond are only words.

Because of the legal demands, special education, bilingual education, all impact on the school as legal demands, however, the kinds of training that should go along in carrying out these mandates often does not take place. If these programs fail it is often the teachers who are blamed for the failure, not the legislators who created the mandates in the first place.

The second strand of circumstances have to do with the educational developments which have appeared in this country over a period of years. Curriculum has altered greatly since I was trained in 1955; emphasis on math and science has grown rapidly.

The interest in this country as having math and science as a priority, has certainly changed.

Kind of socioeconomic conditions which have caused truancy, different kinds of students currently in the school who are alienated to society, those kinds of situations are very difficult for us to deal with.

There is also the concern we have with the preservice preparation of teachers, because that has not actually dovetailed with the actual demands of teaching. The colleges of education do not have at this moment a direct link with the classrooms in the United States.

There is strong evidence that new entrants into the teaching profession would be helped by some sort of mechanism by facilitating the induction period as Ron alluded to and as others have mentioned.

In fact all these and other things appear in the paper.

We believe that the models of teacher education which we as a Nation embrace and the incentives that we create should encourage teacher development and these should be consistent with the scope, scale, needs, and priorities, and the technical sophistication of the society that we teach in.

We cannot always be playing catchup and be on the defensive, and essentially that is what we are doing as teachers who are on the job now.

To borrow an industrial motto, the product under discussion here is the machine of education, and the resource of human capital is America's teachers. The question before us is how to make the capital resource effective and current, so that the investment already made is not wasted. There are 2 million of us, maybe more. About 80 or 90 percent of every school budget goes into teachers' salaries, and it would seem that it is within the interest of the education system itself to make us better at what we do, or help make us better at what we do.

I would point out to you, a recent edition of the New York Times, for Sunday, August 30, the continuing education section talks about industries and private sector practices and about the education of people who are working for them in the private sector. Courses are given on-site to employees, high-level personnel are exposed to a variety of experiences serving as interns to other high-level corporate executives, those who show a great deal of potential are provided with additional educational opportunities. Colleges now are granting credits and courses to people who are working within industry, right at the site of the job.

This kind of education is backed by massive investments of money. Apparently, industry and the private sector realize the importance of continuing professional development and realize that this is important to maintain the competitive edge in the marketplace.

There is another side of the coin and that is the recognition that in all respects, preeminence and success in the future requires investment, research, and experimentation in the present. Interestingly, the Federal Government regardless of the administration has always recognized this.

AFT recognizes the importance of these three aspects if we are to grow as professionals, and we would seek to encourage a Federal role in teacher education which stimulates professional development activities, increases the knowledge base of teachers, and insures the future relevance of teacher education to the needs of society, and also provides incentives for teacher education activities.

Well, how do we do this? Essentially, we have four recommendations to make: We believe that certain flagship programs which had been in existence should be preserved; namely, those like Teacher Center and Teacher Corps, so those of us currently on the job can continue to receive some kind of professional training. Teacher Centers have been a powerful model for upgrading existing staff. We have been able to collaborate with colleges, school districts, we have been able to translate research into practice.

Dr. Goldberg referred before to some of the efforts made at NIE to translate this research into practice.

Through AFT, we have a project whereby classroom management, a concern Ron mentioned as well, is being translated and brought to classroom teachers around the country in three urban areas. It's a start and we would hope to disseminate it further. We are taking that research and providing workshops for the practitioner.

We see that in other countries, like Japan, where there is a heavy emphasis on math and science, to maintain the competitive edge in society, a teacher center has been established to the tune of $38 million for training in math and science. We see the demands on schools have been very great and will continue to grow in the next 20 years, and that a mechanism is needed for absorbing these new kinds of demands. It is not enough to respond with one small program or another small program. For example, we have had environmental education, bilingual, all sorts of moneys have gone into school systems, but what is needed here is probably a mechanism for delivering these kinds of change to the practitioner, directly and effectively. We did see that particular program, a teacher center program, as one way of developing a mechanism for the delivery of new ideas and new priorities.

We also see the Federal Government taking a role in encouraging internships for beginning teachers. We have heard from several people here that this particular transitional time, the time from college graduation to beginning teaching time is critical, it is the make-or-break period in teaching. Teaching is one of the few professions where you are expected to do the same thing on the first day as you are 25 years later; the responsibility and demands are the same and the performance expectations are the same.

In Great Britain since 1968 there has been an acknowledgment of this difficult period of transition, and internship programs as an induction method into teaching have been prevalent and are part of the general training for teaching.

We think too there should be some reconceptualization and redesign of teacher education. Not only is a broad liberal education necessary, but there needs to be some training on the scientific basis of the art of teaching, and there needs to be some thought given to increasing the specialization for the practitioner.

By that I mean the specializations in education have normally gone to people who are on the way up—curriculum developers, researchers. But the specialization of teaching, in other words for me to become a teacher, there is not a set of courses for a line of educational design which I could follow.

There needs to be a great deal of specific attention paid to some of the clinical skills necessary in teaching, observation and analysis, new disciplinary skills, such as psychology and sociology, which bear heavily on the organizations we work in and the students we serve.

We think there are teachers who would be better able to adapt subject matter to students if these additional facets were included in their education.

We think Federal programs, too, designed to aid education of teachers should do just that. One of the shortcomings of the present system is that much of the training money that has been assigned to colleges for the education of teachers, in parentheses, is the kind of education for people who do not normally stay within the school system; their job priorities go elsewhere. Here again, we need assistance to develop that practitioner as a specialist.

We strongly urge the Federal Government to foster a collaborative effort between all those concerned and institutional stakeholders, because without that kind of linkage or collaborative incentive, progress and reform are really unlikely.

I thought a lot about what I would say if I were asked whether education is a priority of the State and truly belongs to the local and the State as a responsibility, and I would say, as far as pupils are concerned, that has always been the case and a fundamental priority. But as far as the education of teachers is concerned, I would say that there are many shortcomings and that the education of teachers has not been a priority.

Those of us who transmit knowledge cannot educate for the future in the context of the past. We cannot always be playing catchup. If teacher education staggers, America's competitive edge will be lost. This is something that the private sector and the Federal Government recognize when it comes to lasers, genetic engineering, and space exploration. We suggest that it is equally compelling with respect to teachers and their training.

Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much.

First, you mention a Federal role in the internships. Have you any specific idea of how the Federal Government might get involved in encouraging that kind of program?

Ms. COOPER. Well, I think, first of all, one of the problems that we find when we talk among ourselves, the fact that there has not been that much study of how we could go about doing this. When we talk about college FTE's and payment for people who work in the field or payment for teachers who work as mentors for beginning teachers, the mechanics of internships need to be worked out.

As a first step, I would see some kind of government incentive to provide a forum for this kind of discussion as to what an internship program should look like.

In New York State, we have had such discussions. We have come up with a variety of plans as to well No. 1, people are interested in how they would be paid, and No. 2, how the intern would relate to the district, No. 3, what would be used as a criterion for accepting or rejecting a person, what the relationship would be between the college, the community, and the intern, and providing an opportunity for people to discuss and come up with some flagship programs, and opportunities to look at others.

In a recent NIE study on internship it was found that only 5 percent of the schools had internships at all, and none of these were like the English system.

Mr. SIMON. You mentioned, Miss Bell, that you took a sabbatical. When you say you took a leave, that was without pay?

Ms. BELL. No; it was at half pay. It is something I feel should be available to every teacher, but it is a necessary step that after 7 years we all go on sabbatical. That should be a national thing to which Federal support should be given.

Mr. SIMON. With what school system?

Ms. BELL. Washington, D.C.

Mr. SIMON. That is interesting. I was not aware you could get half pay. Is that generally available?

Ms. COOPER. No; it is generally unavailable.

Mr. SIMON. At the Baltimore schools——

Mr. SPRUILL. We are not paid for sabbaticals.

Ms. COOPER. New York City has a program of sabbaticals which we fight for every year. After 7 or 6 years, half pay, and after 16 years or more, three-quarters pay for study and/or what is considered R&R.

If I may, Dr. Fred MacDonald and myself began to question experienced teachers concerning critical periods in their teaching and we found after 4 or 7 years when teachers begin to really have experience under their belt and they have classroom management curriculum pretty well in place, there comes a particular time where they need the stimulation of individual growth or change. That happens again in about the 15th or 16th year when one begins to examine one's life, and I suppose these transitional periods coincide with adult development, when you examine what is it I am doing, and what else is there to do in this big, broad world? This is the time when people leave because they do not find the encouragement and enrichment to continue. What they have said to us, it is not the children, I like the children, I am committed and I like the job. It is the system: I am not recognized and I am not valued and there is no place for me to grow. It is not to go, but to grow.

Mr. **Spruill**. I would like to add something on the point about internship. I guess in a sense I had sort of an internship, because when I first started teaching, the principal was ill and not able to make it to the second floor. Therefore I was not under as much pressure as the teachers on the first floor were. There were two new teachers on the second floor and we frequently went to each other's rooms, and if we had a break we would watch the other person teach, and critique. We would create arguments once in a while, but we would critique.

I consider myself to be an outstanding teacher now. I am proud of that because I have worked to that point. I feel one of the reasons I got to that point is the help I have gotten from teachers across the hall and down the stairs from me. A senior teacher is an underpaid vice principal. They come in to help with curriculum. I like the idea of an internship being that similar to a medical internship. I like the idea of teaching schools as medical schools are teaching schools. I like the idea of more equipment and smaller classrooms so we will not damage a child when we make a mistake, because in those first few years, sometimes damaging mistakes can be made if there in not the proper training and supervision.

Mr. **Simon**. Thank you.

In the meantime, just make sure the principal is sick.

Mr. **Simon**. Mr. Coleman had a question.

Ms. **Brand**. He was wondering when teachers are laid off, is it on a case-by-case basis or are the senior teachers kept on? How does that affect you when you are faced with layoffs?

Ms. **Cooper**. They are based on seniority. In New York we had massive layoffs of teachers 3 years ago, 7,000 or 8,000. Right now, we are encountering a teacher shortage. Many of those laid off never returned to education even when recalled. When we tried to find out what they were doing, most were in private industry.

We do have a critical teacher shortage in New York now, particularly in math and science. Unfortunately, during the past summer—well, it is fortunate and unfortunate, we provided six credits of education for those people who had B.A.'s and might be interested in going into teaching. They had six credits and 6 weeks, and yesterday they started in the school system with no internship, no student teaching, and unless ways are found to stimulate people to go into these fields, we are going to be creating a classification of teacher who is least experienced and least likely to succeed in areas of greatest importance to our country.

Ms. **Bell**. In Washington, D.C., we are facing massive layoffs. Even though I am not directly in the system, I have been working with the teachers, and I find it is devastating to those teachers who stay and those who leave. Teachers who are forced out of the system because of layoffs have had to have a period of time where they just pulled themselves back together because they feel it totally as a personal rejection. They put so many years into teaching, then they have to think about retraining and going back to something else. Once they pull themselves together, they do not want to go back into the system. Those who are left are apathetic.

Although it is supposed to be by seniority, there have been complaints it is not always that way. The principal has the right to decide which teachers will leave—I am not sure about it, but I know there have been complaints and some teachers who were laid off who do not feel they should have been.

It also starts to undermine the commitment of the whole system to the education of children.

I have seen some of the people who were 10, 11, and 12 years in the system with master's degrees being laid off. If you have that kind of training in any other field, you would have some kind of job security. Now people are walking around with that kind of training with no job security, and it is a great stress and it is a factor.

Mr. **Simon**. In fact, some of those have a harder time getting a new job because school boards can hire the new young teacher at less money than those with 10 years' experience and a master's degree.

Ms. **Bell**. Exactly. Not only that, we find the school district here is not hiring permanent teachers or probationary teachers, only temporary teachers. There is only a certain group of people who will accept a position on a temporary basis at a salary much lower than if they were permanent or probationary. The temporary teacher does not have to meet all the qualifications of the position; therefore the quality of the teacher is also less.

Mr. **Simon**. If I may ask you, I know you are in the field of education. What are you doing now?

Ms. **Bell**. I have a private center where we offer tutorial assistance, and consultant workshops for educators and others who work with children.

Mr. **Simon**. After hearing all this discussion, Mr. Daniel, do you yearn to get back into the teaching field?

Mr. **Daniel**. I do not know. I keep pretty much in touch. Most of my friends are still in the educational field. I have a great amount of sympathy, but as the lady to my left indicated, it is not the kids, because you are committed. If you go through with the training, you are committed to the kids. It is the system and how you fight it. I think a lot of my friends who left when I did made the decision that cop out or run out, we were not going to fight it. We could take our 5-year experience and if there was a job layoff, we would not have job security. We would spend a summer wondering whether we would be rehired or not. That is not a good way to spend a summer.

Mr. **Simon**. We thank you very, very much for being here and for your testimony. Our subcommittee hearing stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

○